Chapter 4

Immigration and Oppression

Learning Outcomes

After reading this chapter you will know and be able to:

4.1 Describe the origin of xenophobia in the British colonies and the United States and how it contributed to the Nativist attitudes toward immigrants of diverse nationalities.

4.2 Explain how negative attitudes toward immigrants evolved over time and what political actions were taken against immigrants.

4.3 Describe the actions of some individuals and organizations that reflect negative attitudes toward immigrants, explain how immigrants have contributed to the American economy, and debunk persisting myths about contemporary immigrants.

4.4 Explain attitudes toward the cultural and linguistic diversity of the United States, and describe which educational approaches have been most effective for learning English.

“We are all citizens of one world; we are all of one blood. To hate someone because he was born in another country, because he speaks a different language or because he takes a different view on a subject, is a great folly.”

—JOHN COMENIUS (1592–1670)

This section of the text examines the history of oppression in the United States as experienced by immigrants who came to America in pursuit of the American dream. Immigrants encountered discomfort, rejection, and even persecution because they arrived as “foreigners” with different customs, traditions, attitudes, and beliefs. Immigrants of color also experienced oppression based on their race, and followers of certain religions have been oppressed for their beliefs. Andrzewjewski (1996) has provided a comprehensive definition of oppression:

Oppression exists when any entity (society, organization, group, or individual) intentionally or unintentionally distributes resources inequitably, refuses to share power, imposes ethnocentric culture, and/or maintains unresponsive and inflexible institutions toward another entity for its supposed benefit and rationalizes its actions by blaming or ignoring the victim. (p. 56)

As British colonists settled in America, other Europeans quickly followed, and this ethnic diversity aroused their xenophobia—the fear of or prejudice against people from other nations. As Kammen (1972) noted, European colonists came to America with racist notions of Africans and Native Americans that "justified" enslaving them. But ethnic diversity presented a challenge to be resolved. The French who settled to the north in Canada had readily adapted to Indian ways, especially with regard to economic practices such as trapping and through intermarriage with Indian women. The Spanish came as conquerors, but after their conquest, they still required Native American labor to sustain their control of conquered territory. Like the French, the Spanish borrowed cultural elements from conquered peoples, and intermarriages produced what would eventually be termed a new race: “La Raza.” Yet in the American colonies, British colonists chose to retain their identity and to maintain their position as the dominant group; even today, Americans are still caught in an ongoing paradox of established immigrants fearing each wave of newcomers.

Those who settled the English-speaking colonies tended to emigrate in family groups. Although some immigrants came to seek their fortune and return home, most came to establish permanent settlements. The British came as subjects of the English king, prepared to create an English colony as an extension of Britain. Although settlers occasionally used information gained from Indians about such things as edible plants and food preparation, their goal was to recreate as much of the Old World as was possible in the New World.

The problem with recreating the Old World was that it was not possible to make the colonies into a new England. In addition to British colonists (English, Scottish, and Irish), significant numbers of Dutch, German, and French colonists arrived, as well as small groups from other European countries and adventurers from parts of the world other than Europe. Germans in particular were as adamant as the English about maintaining their cultural heritage. They lived together in communities, spoke to each other in German, posted signs in German, imported books from Germany, and founded schools where their children were taught in German.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, British colonial leaders became so alarmed by German behavior that some called for restrictions or exclusions of Germans from further immigration. Benjamin Franklin believed it was necessary to Anglicize the Germans because of the size of their population. As their numbers continued to grow, he feared that the Germans

would “shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of us Anglifying them” (Feagin, 1997, p. 18). Although Franklin obviously shared the desire of British colonists to Anglicize the colonies, he also recognized positive attributes of German immigrants and the contributions they were making to colonial development: “All that seems necessary is to distribute them more equally, mix them with the English, and establish English schools where they are now too thick settled” (Brands, 2000, p. 219).

Franklin was concerned with Anglicizing Germans and all immigrants who were not from Britain and, therefore, unfamiliar with British customs and language. In 1749, he sponsored the establishment of a school that included no foreign language instruction. His desire to Anglicize foreign colonists was also reflected in the views of President George Washington: “The more homogeneous our citizens can be made . . . the greater will be our prospect of permanent union” (Kammen, 1972, p. 74). Perhaps the desire for a more homogeneous citizenry was the reason the New American Congress passed a law in 1790 that limited citizenship in the United States to immigrants who were “White.” This early expression of xenophobia would lead to the growth of nativism in the United States.

“Law is a reflection and source of prejudice. It both enforces and suggests forms of bias.”

—DIANE SCHULDER (1937–)

Causes of Xenophobia and Nativism in the United States

Assimilation refers to a process in which immigrants adopt cultural traits from their host country and are absorbed into society (see Figure 4.1). British colonists preferred a homogeneous population of immigrants who could be assimilated into a dominant Anglo culture, but immigrants from other countries often insisted on maintaining their own ethnic heritages. Their desires contributed to the development of xenophobia in response to the constant infusion of ethnicities among immigrants to America. When established immigrants, who considered themselves “natives,” felt threatened by the many non-British immigrants, organizations based on nativist concerns would appear. Feagin and Feagin (1996) define nativism as “an anti-immigrant ideology that advocates the protection of native inhabitants of a country from [new or potential] immigrants who are seen as threatening or dangerous” (p. 503). Nativists have been the primary group engaging in the oppression of immigrants.

Figure 4.1 Assimilation Issues?

The cartoonist illustrates that assimilation has to do with power; there must be a dominant cultural group to demand that members of other groups assimilate to their cultural norms.

Source: The Denver Post.

Figure 4.1 Full Alternative Text

Franklin’s desire to Anglicize non-British immigrants and Washington’s desire for a homogeneous population can be described as a benign form of nativism based on nationalistic concerns. Although nationalism represents one of the primary themes of nativist activities in the United States, two additional themes have characterized many nativist attitudes and actions: anti-Catholicism and anti-radicalism.

Why were Nativists anti-Catholic?

Although the religious beliefs of Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and other founders of the American republic were quite different from those of most Christians today, at its birth the United States was a nation strongly influenced by Protestant Christianity. The presence of Catholics had been tolerated throughout the colonial period, but by 1820, the 200,000 Catholics in the United States stimulated anti-Catholic sentiment, especially in urban areas. (See Figure 4.2.) By 1850, there were almost two million Catholics in the United States; the Irish alone constituted 42 percent of that foreign-born population (Fuchs, 1990).

Figure 4.2 Anti-Catholic Attitudes

A major factor in the anti-Catholic sentiment was the fear that Catholics would try to convert Protestants, especially children. The cartoonist, Thomas Nast, made Catholic bishops into alligators coming to U.S. shores, reflecting such fears.

Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division [Thomas Nast/LC-USZ6-790]

Figure 4.2 Full Alternative Text

During George Washington’s presidency, immigrants were required to be U.S. residents for a minimum of five years to be eligible for citizenship. The Nationalization Act signed by President John Adams changed the requirement to 14 years of residency, but it was returned to five years after Thomas

Jefferson became president. A nativist group calling itself “Native Americans” began forming in some of the larger cities; the party lobbied vigorously against immigrants becoming eligible for citizenship after five years. The Native American party insisted on a residency of 21 years before an immigrant was eligible for citizenship. Their main concern was voting, arguing that immigrants coming from nations governed by monarchs were not prepared to be self-governing. Since an immigrant came with:

all his foreign habits, prejudices and predilections . . . can it be believed that he can disburden himself so completely of these, and have so learned to fulfill the duties of a citizen of the United States, in the very short term of five years? (Myers, 1960, p. 111)

At first, the Native American party encouraged people to welcome immigrants, only opposing their eligibility for citizenship after five years, but by 1843, the movement had become hostile to continued immigration of both Irish and Catholics. In Philadelphia, the Native American party held a meeting in an Irish district of the city, initiating a confrontation between Protestants and Catholics; the violence that followed culminated in an angry mob setting fire to many buildings, and was reported in newspapers around the country. Federal troops were called in to restore order, which was no easy task, and peace prevailed for a little more than a month before mobs attacked a Catholic church and troops fired at the crowd to force them to disperse. Two more days of violence resulted in two soldiers being killed and 26 soldiers wounded.

Being confronted with such extreme violence was unusual, but American Catholics employed a number of strategies in response to anti-Catholic activities. To avoid having their children subjected to anti-Catholic sentiments in public schools, Catholics created their own privately funded K–12 schools nationwide, eventually establishing Catholic colleges and universities as well. To counter anti-Catholic rhetoric in mainstream and Protestant newspapers, Catholics published their own newspapers. Hennesey (1985) described how Bishop John Hughes submitted several anti-Catholic articles to a Protestant newspaper under the name of “Cranmer” and then publicly announced that he was the author and that the articles included lies and distortions that the editors had not bothered to question or confirm. In addition, several Catholic organizations were founded in the 1800s, including the Knights of Columbus, which engaged in political activism but also provided centers for recreational activities and chapels for meditation and prayer. By the 1920s, church leaders adopted a different strategy, encouraging Catholics to become

involved with “general reform groups in society and not limit their exertions to narrowly conceived partisan issues” (Hennesey, 1985, p. 247).

Why were Nativists opposed to radical immigrants?

Both anti-Catholicism and prejudice against the Irish fueled the nativism movement that flourished briefly in the 1850s, but the other negative sentiment contributing to the success of nativism was anti-radicalism. Most immigrants admitted to the United States in the first decades of the nineteenth century were overwhelmingly impoverished European laborers with minimal skills and little education. Some were sponsored by American capitalists to be contract laborers who would be paid less than the wage native workers would accept. As new immigrant workers adapted to life in the United States, they came to realize how they were being exploited; many joined or helped create unions to demand better wages and benefits by engaging in strikes, marches, and protests. Nativists saw union actions as un-American, especially when the “foreigners” expressed socialist, anarchist, or other radical ideas. The antagonism toward what was regarded as radical activities by recent immigrants was clearly and frequently expressed on the editorial pages of urban newspapers (Higham, 1955):

“Our National existence and . . . our National and social institutions are at stake.”“These people are not Americans, but the very scum and offal of Europe.”“Europe’s human and inhuman rubbish.” (p. 55)

The first quotation illustrates a nationalism often expressed by nativists; the other two quotations reveal hostility and a dehumanized view of perceived “radicals.” The un-American implication in each statement is central to the nativist perspective. Nativist concerns at that time also had to do with the decreasing amount of land available for immigrants in the Midwest and West; as a result, immigrants increasingly settled in urban areas. Because many immigrants were moving from southern and eastern Europe, land reformer Henry George commented, “What, in a few years more, are we to do for a dumping ground? Will it make our difficulty the less that our human garbage can vote?” (Higham, 1955, p. 42). The issue of immigrants becoming eligible for citizenship and voting continued to fuel the xenophobia, and nativist political actions document a fear of the potential political power of incoming immigrants.

Self-Check 4.1 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of the origin of xenophobia in the British colonies and the United States, and

how it contributed to the Nativist attitudes toward immigrants of diverse nationalities.

Nativism, Politics, and Social Change

The Native American party never gained political dominance, yet by the 1850s it had prepared the way for the rise of the “Know-Nothings,” a somewhat secret movement whose members were told to respond to any question about the organization by saying that they knew nothing about it. Staunchly anti-immigrant and anti-Catholic, Know-Nothings were concerned with what they perceived as the growing political influence of Catholics; these fears were confirmed by President Franklin Pierce’s appointment of a Catholic, James Campbell, to be the nation’s attorney general.

How successful were the nativists in their political activities?

The Know-Nothings fielded candidates for the American Party, and in 1854 elected 9 governors, 8 (of 62) senators, and 104 (of 234) members of the House of Representatives (Myers, 1960). In the 1856 elections, Know-Nothing members used force and threats to keep immigrants from voting and encouraged election-day riots in Louisville, Kentucky, and St. Louis, Missouri. When the Whig Party refused to nominate Millard Fillmore for a second term as president, the American Party nominated him as their candidate. Despite the success of other American Party candidates, Fillmore received only eight electoral votes.

Reaction to the political success of the Know-Nothings was swift. In Congress a resolution was submitted, then voted down, condemning secret organizations and citing the Know-Nothings as a specific example. Political and religious leaders across the nation denounced the activities of the Know-Nothings, including the young political aspirant Abraham Lincoln, who wrote in a letter to a friend,

As a nation we began by declaring that, “all men are created equal.” We now practically read it, “all men are created equal except Negroes.” When the Know-Nothings obtain control it will read: “all men are created equal except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics.” (Myers, 1960, P. 146)

Why did nativists fail to form a major political party?

The political success of nativism in the 1850s was brief because the issue of slavery began to take precedence over anti-Catholic prejudice and fears, and it divided the Know-Nothings. By the end of the Civil War, the Know-Nothings and the American Party were no longer a political force, although the nativist

fears that fueled their activity persisted as a major influence in the United States. As the American people debated the issue of slavery, American capitalists continued to sponsor importation of labor from overseas to keep wages low and profits high.

Throughout U.S. history, a significant percentage of Americans consisted of recent immigrants or children of immigrants who appreciated the opportunities in America and vigorously opposed attempts by nativists to restrict immigration. Meanwhile, there was constant pressure from society to promote the Americanization of immigrants, and public schools carried out societal expectations by encouraging immigrants to abandon their heritage and conform to American ways (Pai & Adler, 2006). Nativist attitudes in the United States continued to wax and wane, with xenophobia historically balanced by those who believed in America as a place for oppressed people to achieve freedom and fortune.

The demand for Americanization of immigrants intensified in the late 1800s as the majority of immigrants were not northern Europeans—they were Greeks, Italians, Slavs, and Jews—people who did not conform to the Anglo ideal. Because of an economic downturn in the 1890s, nativism experienced a renewed popularity with American people; then in the ebb and flow of xenophobia, nativist fears succumbed to a confidence inspired by the U.S. triumph in the Spanish-American War and by heroes such as Teddy Roosevelt. Although nativists never again succeeded in sponsoring an independent political party, events in the early twentieth century would establish the foundation for their greatest political triumphs.

Video Example 4.1

In this video, students explore immigration through writing journal entries in the voices of immigrants. Pay attention to how the teacher frames the unit and engages with students. Do you feel that journaling is an effective strategy for teaching and learning about immigration? Why or why not?

What influenced twentieth-century nativist attitudes in America?

It seemed certain to most Americans that if the United States were going to become a dominant political and economic power in the world, immigrants would be needed in the labor market of its dynamic economy. But when World War I began, attitudes changed. Nativism surged again, driven by feelings of nationalism and anti-radicalism. German Americans were singled

out, and their loyalty to the United States was questioned. Rumors abounded that German Americans were spying for Germany.

“There is no room in this country for hyphenated Americans.”

—THEODORE ROOSEVELT (1858–1919)

Because German Americans insisted on maintaining their dual identity as Americans of German descent, influential people such as Teddy Roosevelt admonished them by denouncing all immigrants who claimed a dual identity. German Americans were surprised by such criticisms. From colonial times they had maintained their culture, language, and traditions through separate schools, organizations, and newspapers; these efforts had been tolerated by American society because of the German Americans’ industriousness. At the start of World War I, however, nativist individuals and organizations attacked German Americans for keeping themselves separate and not assimilating to an Anglo ideal.

During World War I, surging patriotism intensified the demand that immigrants be Americanized quickly. Although this nationalism was a less abrasive form of nativism, it became more virulent when reinforced by anti-radical attitudes. Radical organizations were attacked as un-American, especially radical unions like the International Workers of the World, the “Wobblies.” Nativists accused certain immigrants of espousing ideas that were disloyal to the country and demanded their deportation.

German Americans were not the only targets of anti-American accusations. Anti-Semitism—having prejudices, stereotypes, or engaging in discrimination against Jewish people—increased with the success of the Russian Revolution in 1917. After World War I, nativists continued to complain that the Anglo ideal for America would disappear if diverse European ethnic groups continued to emigrate; however, most Americans seemed to believe that those who came would eventually assimilate into the dominant culture.

By the 1920s, a revised perspective was being expressed. In settlement houses such as Hull House in Chicago, people providing social services began to appreciate the diversity of the immigrants. Social activist Jane Addams, cofounder of Hull House, and University of Chicago philosopher John Dewey described the advantages of diverse cultures and the value of people maintaining their heritages while still learning, as Benjamin Franklin had recommended, the language and customs of American culture. Although resentment toward Germans slowly dissipated after the war, anti-Semitism

persisted as part of a new development in xenophobic attitudes in the United States—the influence of racism.

How did racism affect nativist attitudes and actions?

In 1899, William Z. Ripley published a so-called scientific study identifying three European races: Teutonic, Alpine, and Mediterranean (Higham, 1955). Based on emerging theories about race, nativists argued that for U.S. citizenry to achieve unity, immigrants of the blue-eyed, blond-haired Teutonic type (also called “Nordic” or “Anglo Saxon”) should be given preference. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts called for an end to all further immigration, and Teddy Roosevelt chastised Anglo Saxon women in America for contributing to the possibility of “race suicide” by not producing as many children as immigrant women (Brodkin, 2002). In the aftermath of World War I, pessimism about diverse groups being able to assimilate into an Anglo Saxon American culture fueled racist sentiments expressed in widely read books such as Lothrop Stoddard’s The Rising Tide of Color. (See Figure 4.3.)

Figure 4.3 White Supremacy

This advertisement from a 1923 Time magazine warns its readers that the days of White supremacy may be numbered and urges White people who want to do something about it to read Stoddard’s book, The Rising Tide of Color.

Source: Time magazine.

Figure 4.3 Full Alternative Text

Madison Grant (1916/1970) provided the most influential expression of this pessimism in The Passing of the Great Race. Grant rejected the idea that immigrants with other than Nordic heritage could achieve the Anglo Saxon ideal; thus the “Great Race” of Anglo Saxons was doomed to disappear in America. Claiming that his ideas were grounded in the emerging science of genetics, Grant concluded that intermarriage between races produced degraded offspring who would revert to lower qualities in their parents’ genes. Referring to Ripley’s European races, Grant stated, “The cross between any of the European races and a Jew is a Jew” (p. 16). Confirming Grant’s assertion, the eugenics movement provided “scientific” evidence of the human degradation caused by miscegenation, and 30 states passed laws banning interracial marriage (Stubblefield, 2007). Many respected Americans such as automaker Henry Ford expressed beliefs consistent with Grant’s theories, and Grant’s popular book was translated into other languages.

According to historians, the German translation became known as Adolf Hitler's "bible" (Aronson & Amatullah, 2016).

Nativists used the new racist concern for preserving the nation's Anglo Saxon heritage to sound the alarm about the numbers of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe—80 percent of all U.S. immigrants from 1900 to 1910. Nativists triumphed in 1924 with the passage of an immigration law establishing quotas for immigrants based on country of origin. The quotas ensured that immigrants from northern Europe would constitute the majority of U.S. immigrants; these guidelines remained largely unchanged for the next four decades. Although people of color were the primary targets of nativists, other groups were also affected by racist attitudes.

What groups were affected by the addition of racism to xenophobia?

This new racist form of nativism was directed not only against people of color but also against White people perceived as not being "White enough." This was especially observed in southern states. In 1898, debates at Louisiana's state constitutional convention focused on who would be denied the right to vote. Although Black people were the main targets, Italians were considered "as black as the blackest negro in existence" (Barrett & Roediger, 2002, p. 32). Because of such perceptions, some Italians were victims of violence in the nineteenth century. In Tallulah, Louisiana, five Sicilian immigrants owned businesses serving primarily Black customers. Before long, the locals fabricated a quarrel over a goat and lynched the five Sicilians (Higham, 1955).

Most Americans of that era accepted the idea of perceiving Italians, Irish, or others as separate races based on their

national origins. In time, the idea of national origin defining separate races declined as skin color became the primary determinant of racial identity. There were only minimal changes to the immigration law favoring White immigrants, but following World War II, this became one of the targets of a social movement challenging the nation to address problems of racism.

As the civil rights movement gained momentum, allegations of racism increased. President John Kennedy admitted to inequities in immigration policies based on the 1924 law. Attorney General Robert Kennedy stated the issue more bluntly, "As we are working to remove the vestiges of racism from our public life, we cannot maintain racism as the cornerstone of our immigration laws" (Eck, 2001, p. 7). In 1965, Congress eliminated the racially biased National Origins Quotas by passing the Immigration and Nationality

Act. Since then, the numbers of immigrants of color have increased dramatically, and so has nativism. The influx of illegal immigrants has also stirred anti-immigrant sentiments and created controversy even though individual and corporate employers are often dependent on them.

Figure 4.4 Full Alternative Text

Self-Check 4.2 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of how negative attitudes toward immigrants evolved over time and the political actions that were taken against immigrants.

The Paradox of Xenophobia and Nativism in a Nation of Immigrants

Daniels (2002) noted the absurdity among Americans to regard the people who first came to the United States as “colonists” or “settlers” and then to identify the people who came later as “immigrants.” Part of being accepted involved the former immigrants expressing xenophobic sentiments against current immigrants. Although Americans have not consistently expressed such negative sentiments, author John Steinbeck (1966) observed the following pattern:

We gave [immigrants] disparaging names: Micks, Sheenies, Krauts, Dagos, Wops . . . until [each group] became sound, solvent . . . whereupon each group joined the older boys and charged down on the newest ones . . . Having suffered, one would have thought they might have pity on the newcomer, but they did not (p. 15).

To support their anti-immigrant sentiments and actions, nativists would increasingly use the work of scholars and scientists within the growing ranks of the eugenics movement.

How did the eugenics movement influence anti-immigrant attitudes?

British scientist Francis Galton coined the term eugenics as “the study of agencies under social control that may improve or repair the racial qualities of future generations, either physically or mentally” (Lynn, 2001, p. 4). American scholars endorsing the eugenics movement were concerned about the perceived degeneration of mental abilities among Americans. Many believed there was a racial component to the problem represented by immigrants, whom they regarded as the primary cause of this decline of intelligence in America. As Stubblefield (2007) noted, many scholars believed

that “White people were ‘civilization builders,’ while members of other races supposedly lacked the ability to produce civilization” (p. 163). Scholarly support for the eugenics movement would decline precipitously after the Nazis tainted it with their emphasis on race purification and their implementation of genocidal practices.

Although the eugenics movement in the United States never attracted a majority of academics, some in the eugenics camp were influential scholars: Robert Yerkes of Harvard (president of the American Psychological Association), Lewis Terman of Stanford, and Edward Thorndike from Teachers College, Columbia University (Selden, 2006). Because of their academic interests, Yerkes, Terman, and Thorndike were responsible for developing early intelligence tests (see Table 4.1). When Henry Goddard implemented intelligence tests with the immigrants at Ellis Island, he reported that 80 percent were “feeble minded” (Brodkin, 2002).

Alpha and Beta Tests developed by psychologists Robert Yerkes, Louis Terman, and Henry Goddard assisted by Carl Campbell Brigham, Founder of Educational Testing Service (ETS).These sample questions reveal how culturally biased and inappropriate the early tests of “intelligence” could be; yet such tests were used with immigrants to determine which ones were of acceptable intelligence and which were “feeble minded.”

Source: Owen, David. None of the Above: The Truth Behind the SATs, 1999, p. 176 and History Matters at: http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5293

Because some respected scholars supported it, the eugenics movement flourished from 1910 to 1940, shaping the content of biology textbooks, reinforcing popular views concerning White supremacy, and contributing to the growth of anti-immigrant attitudes. One legacy of the eugenics movement is the standardized testing that students still take today to measure academic achievement—but testing is not the only legacy of the eugenics movement.

Established in 1937 to promote eugenics policies, the Pioneer Fund advocated the forcible removal of “American Negroes” to Africa. The first Pioneer Fund President, Harry Laughlin, wrote the Model Eugenical Sterilization Law, adopted by 30 states in the United States and Nazi Germany. Laughlin proposed that Adolf Hitler be given honorary membership in the American Eugenics Society. The Pioneer Fund continues to support scholars working on race-based IQ theories as part of their ongoing support

for eugenics research (Rendall, 2014), and it has also been a major funding source for the English Only movement (DeParle, 2011).

What is the English Only movement?

Nativists have always been critical of immigrants who maintain their native language. They lobbied for literacy tests to reduce immigration, but for almost two decades Congress rejected the idea. When Congress finally passed such legislation, both Democratic and Republican presidents vetoed these laws until 1917, when Congress passed this requirement over President Wilson's veto (Delgado, 1997). Nativist opposition to immigrants maintaining their native language was evident in their criticisms of German immigrants, and culminated during World War I with state and local laws that forbade public displays of signs with German words and banned the teaching of German in public schools. In some communities German textbooks were burned as an act of patriotism (Crawford, 2000). The percentage of students taking German in U.S. high schools went from 25 percent in 1915 to 0.6 percent by 1922 (Baron, 2000). Today, English Only advocates demand that English be declared the "official language" of the United States, and they are working on that goal using a state-by-state strategy. English Only supporters claim that their desire to establish English as the official language of the United States is simply a response to those immigrants who refuse to learn how to speak English (US English, 2014).

English Only proponents point to the existence of dual language street signs, billboards, and government brochures and to bilingual instruction in schools. They believe that the use of non-English languages, especially in bilingual instruction, legitimizes these languages and elevates their status as well as the status of those who speak them. Yet studies do not indicate a threat to the widespread use of English since well over 90 percent of U.S. residents speak English fluently. Of the 55 million Americans who speak a language other than English at home, 51 million (92 percent) are fluent in English (Grosjean, 2012). Critics of English Only have argued that the real driving force behind this organization is not the failure of immigrants to learn English but the beliefs of the group's leaders and supporters.

Video Example 4.2

In this video, immigrant students discuss their experiences in American classrooms. What are some of the suggestions these students have for their teachers and peers for being more respectful and inclusive?

Baron (2000) argues that the history of such organizations “often masks racism and certainly fails to appreciate cultural difference” (p. 447). Crawford (2000) reported on an investigation of US English, a major English Only organization, that found evidence of their real agenda: “determination to resist racial and cultural diversity in the United States” (p. 23). In a survey of financial supporters of U.S. English to ascertain the reason for their support, 42 percent of respondents agreed with the statement: “I wanted America to stand strong and not cave in to Hispanics who shouldn’t be here” (p. 24). Reviewing efforts to pass English Only legislation, Baron (2000) concludes: “no matter how idealistic or patriotic its claims . . . (it has) a long history of nativism, racism, and religious bigotry” (p. 451).

Immigrants have tended to learn English out of necessity for economic and social well-being. Today, about 20 percent of Americans speak a language other than English: fewer than 7 percent of Americans speak no English (Grosjean, 2012; Ryan, 2013). Despite these facts, the English Only movement has been successful; by 2014, 31 states had passed laws declaring English as the official language. In some states these laws are largely symbolic—no penalties are enforced, and teaching foreign languages or implementing and supporting bilingual programs are not prohibited—but other states have passed laws that prohibit their governments from printing materials in other languages.

Spanish is the first language of the majority of immigrants, so English Only laws largely affect Latino immigrants, preventing many from being able to gain access to useful information. Such laws may also prevent legally eligible people from voting. Whether symbolic or harmful, English Only laws reflect the attitudes of many Americans against recent immigrants, especially people of color who are not fluent or literate in English upon their arrival. For example, activities of English Only advocates surged following the passage of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act; by eliminating national origins as a consideration, this reform radically changed the demographics of those immigrating to the United States.

What changes in immigration have occurred since the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965?

Prior to 1965, most U.S. immigrants were White and primarily European, but in the first three decades after this immigration reform was implemented, about 80 percent of immigrants were people of color coming from Central and South America, the Caribbean, and Asia (Roberts, 1997). Foreign-born immigrants now constitute about 13 percent of the U. S. population, and they

account for 23 percent of all births. In the period between 2005 and 2050, the children of immigrants will represent 80 percent of the population growth in the United States (Kenny, 2015). From 1970 to 2000, more than 20 million immigrants became permanent U.S. residents, and 3 million achieved this status even though they had initially entered the country illegally (Chavez, 2009). There are over 40 million Latinos in the United States, representing 15 percent of the workforce, and they are expected to exceed 50 million people and constitute 18 percent of the workforce in 2018 (Pabst, 2011). Given such numbers, it should not be surprising that Latinos are beginning to have an increasing political influence in states where they are concentrated, such as Florida, Virginia, California, and Texas. Further, demographers predict that people of color, especially Latinos, will continue to be the majority of immigrants in the future. From 2010 to 2050, the population of the United States is expected to increase by almost 150 million, and 82 percent of this increase will be people of color who immigrated after 2005 and their descendants. By 2050, it appears likely that over half (53 percent) of Americans will be people of color (Meacham, 2009), and some Americans have reacted to such predictions with fear and anxiety, resulting in the perpetuation of nativist attitudes and activities.

What American nativist attitudes and actions are evident today?

A focal point for nativist activity is the 2000-mile border between the United States and Mexico. In 1990, the United States built a steel wall on the border near San Diego. Since 2006, over 1000 miles of fencing has been built at a cost of $3.5–$6.5 million per mile, with maintenance costs expected to reach $60 billion by 2035 (Henderson, 2011). On January 25, 2017, newly elected President Donald Trump issued an executive order shifting federal funds to pay for further construction of the wall, but the order did not stipulate what existing funds would be used for this purpose. The Government Accountability Office has estimated that the cost of just a single-layer fence will likely be equal to if not higher than the cost for building the existing wall with an additional $4.2 million per mile for roads and collateral costs as well as the ongoing cost of maintaining a 2000 mile wall (Davis, Sanger, & Haberman, 2017). Critics challenge the efficacy of this plan for keeping out illegal immigrants since a wall cannot be built through the Rio Grande River, which flows along the border in many parts of Texas. The river’s banks are a designated flood plain that is governed by international treaty. A 2017 Associated Press poll reported that 58 percent of Americans oppose expanding the existing wall, and some of the strongest opposition comes

from ranchers and other landowners who will have to sell part of their land to the government in order to construct the wall (Lee, 2017).

To address concerns about terrorists infiltrating the immigrant population to gain entry into the United States, additional Border Patrol agents have been hired; yet a study reported that over a two-year period 12 immigrants were charged with terrorist activity (0.0015 percent of all immigrants), with six charges being dropped and one dismissed (Nevins, 2010). Another significant issue has been the high turnover rate for the Border Patrol, higher than police departments or other comparable law enforcement agencies (Browne, 2014). Nevins (2010) suggested that it is related to the nature of their work.

The increased Border Patrol presence does not appear to have addressed the concerns about immigrants entering the United States illegally. Nevins (2010) cited a study acknowledging that it was more difficult to cross the U.S./Mexican border, but the study went on to note that two thirds of those seeking illegal entry were still successful, and of the one third who were caught, 92–97 percent of them persisted in their efforts to cross the border. As Schuck (2014) noted: “Border . . . enforcement, despite large and growing costs, have not prevented the illegal presence of an estimated ten to eleven million undocumented immigrants” (p. 243). Further, one of the major factors frustrating this effort to control the border is the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Because of NAFTA, approximately 222,000 vehicles cross the border every day, and of necessity, Border Patrol agents allow much of that traffic to pass uninspected.

In 2013, a new immigration issue arose as the Border Patrol reported a significant increase in the number of unaccompanied children apprehended while illegally crossing the U.S./Mexican border—nearly 39,000, representing an increase of almost 60 percent from the previous year (Gordon, 2014). By the summer of 2014, the number of unaccompanied children illegally crossing the border increased even more. Approximately 74 percent of these children came from Central America—primarily from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador—with most of the rest coming from Mexico. Other Central American nations also experienced increased numbers of migrants seeking asylum, including Panama, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica (Lind, 2014). These nations have their own problems with poverty, but their citizens were less likely to encounter violence, and that is a major factor behind this Central American migration.

Honduras and El Salvador have the highest murder rates in the world, with Guatemala not far behind in fifth place (Gordon, 2014). Gang wars in the

three countries have created extremely dangerous conditions for all citizens but especially for those living in poverty and especially for their children. These children came to the border to seek asylum (a safe place; a shelter from danger). Some Americans insisted that these children and youth were illegal immigrants and should be deported immediately, but in 2002, Congress passed a law establishing a specific process for screening unaccompanied child migrants. Under this law, child migrants from Mexico could be returned right away, but not unaccompanied children from Central American nations. The process begins with an asylum officer interviewing the unaccompanied child, and any child not approved for asylum proceeds to immigration court for a deportation hearing. During this hearing, the court can decide if the child is qualified for some kind of status that requires humanitarian protection (Lind, 2014).

Latinos comprise the majority of immigrants, whether they are children or adults, so the anti-immigrant backlash is largely directed at them, especially in areas such as Southern California where the Mexican population is expected to increase by two thirds from 2000 to 2020. Scherer (2005) quotes one Southern Californian's reaction: "Migration from Mexico is the catalyst that's starting the demise of America" (p. 57). This is not an isolated opinion. According to a 2010 survey by the Pew Research Center, nearly half of Americans agreed with the statement that immigrants "threaten traditional American customs and values" and only 39 percent believed that immigrants "strengthen our country because of their hard work and talents" (Navarro, 2011, p. A18). Despite such negative attitudes, a number of U.S. communities have erected signs in English and Spanish announcing sites that are places to procure day laborers, and many Americans hire Latino immigrants at these sites for minimal compensation. (See Figure 4.4.)

Figure 4.4 Day Labor Site

An immigrant waits to be hired at a day labor pickup site in Santa Barbara, California, an upscale oceanside community. Note the city-posted sign sanctioning this site, and the portable toilets provided for day laborers who must wait here, sometimes for many hours, before being picked up for a job.

Source: Kent Koppelman

Anti-immigrant sentiment may be waning, according to recent polls. Blake (2014) reported that 46 percent of Americans believe immigrants should be welcomed, with 56 percent believing that immigration strengthens the United States, and more Americans recognize that immigrants contribute to

our nation. 41 percent of Americans call for less immigration, perhaps expressing their concern about undocumented workers. Some Americans assume all undocumented workers entered the United States illegally, but at least 40 percent crossed the border legally with a visa, were hired for a job, and then remained after their visa expired (Papademetriou, 2013). Employers may prefer to keep these workers, so they don't ask them if their visas have expired. Meanwhile, anti-immigrant invective may be contributing to an increase in violence against people perceived as immigrants, especially Latinos. In 2008, two men from Brooklyn attacked two brothers from Ecuador because they were Latinos, yet both were legal immigrants. One of the brothers died. In 2010, a man in Arizona shot and killed his Latino neighbor after they argued about the state's controversial new immigration law; the victim was a third generation American. In 2011, a group of men shouting anti-Mexican slurs attacked a Latino man at his home in Staten Island (Potok, 2011). A Bureau of Justice Statistics report found that hate crimes against Latinos tripled from 2011 to 2012 (Haglage, 2014).

Another immigrant group that has garnered attention is known as "The Dreamers." The term refers to over 800,000 youth brought illegally to the United States during their childhood whose academic success has demonstrated that they have the ability to make a positive contribution to this society if they are allowed to stay. Neither Congress nor the White House have proposed legislation to address the issue, and late in 2017, President Trump announced his decision to order the Department of Homeland Security to cancel the program. In 2018, a federal judge ruled that the Trump administration must reinstate the program, allowing participants to renew their status, and accept new applications (Robbins & Dickerson, 2018). The uncertainty about the fate of the program continues, but in the spring of 2018, the President announced that his administration was ending the temporary protected status for immigrants from nations such as Honduras and El Salvador. The decision has alarmed Dreamers who fear they may have to face a similar dilemma (Foley, 2018).

Deportations have nearly doubled from 2005 to 2010 (Navarro, 2011), causing lasting harm to many families. Nevins (2010) wrote of a father who was deported to Colombia as his 17-year-old son began his junior year in high school. The young man was so depressed over his father's absence that he committed suicide. When the father asked for permission to attend his son's funeral, the U.S. government denied his request. From 1998 to 2007, deportations separated over a million individuals from their families, including children who were American citizens by birth. Many of these

families were forced to accept the separation of a spouse or parent because keeping the family together required “uprooting their children from a community and lifestyle that is all (the children) have ever known” (Nevins, 2010, p. 187). Responding to criticism, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (2014) began focusing on deporting individuals involved in criminal activity. In 2013, 82 percent of those living in the interior of the United States who were deported had been convicted of a crime, and 84 percent of those deported without a criminal conviction were caught at the border trying to enter the United States illegally.

Arizona passed a bill outlawing the teaching of ethnic studies in schools. This law was primarily a response to the Tucson School District, which had developed courses on Mexican American studies, Native American studies, and African American studies. State Superintendent Tom Horne defended the bill, arguing that such classes were racially segregated and accusing the program of teaching antipathy toward White people and hatred of America. There was little evidence to support this criticism and more evidence to refute it. For example, one instructor taught a Luis Valdez poem that emphasized the concept of the Golden Rule, an ethical principle found in all major world religions. What critics called antipathy was in reality efforts by instructors to promote critical thinking as they explored literature and history (Carjuzaa, Baldwin, & Munson, 2015). Further, the course content was relevant and meaningful to the students, in part because it affirmed their cultural identities. Students did not reject American values because, as Mexican Americans, American values were as much a part of them as is true for all American students. Latino students enrolled in Mexican American studies had higher test scores and were more likely to graduate from high school than Latino students not enrolled in the program.

The response by Arizona’s legislature was not surprising given the state's history. For example, state legislators voted against celebrating Martin Luther

King Jr.’s birthday as a holiday in 1986 and voted to to eliminate bilingual education in 2000. In January 2011, Arizona’s new State Superintendent of Schools, John Huppenthal, ordered an audit of the ethnic studies courses at Tucson’s schools to ensure they were in compliance with the new ethnic studies law. In June, the audit report concluded that these courses did not violate the state law, went on to praise the academic success promoted by the ethnic studies program, and recommended that these courses be retained in the high school’s core curriculum. Ignoring the audit, Huppenthal declared that the Tucson School District was in violation of the new state law

and might lose $15 million of state funding. As students registered for classes for the fall 2011 semester, there were reports that the counselors assisting students were discouraging them from enrolling in ethnic studies classes and that faculty teaching ethnic studies courses were being reassigned to teach other classes. Eleven Tucson teachers filed a lawsuit against the state, alleging that the ethnic studies law was unconstitutional. In September 2017, a federal judge ruled the law unconstitutional and clearly stated the motivation for the law as “the enactment and enforcement were motivated by racial animus” (Bloomekatz, 2017, 8).

“We must get rid of fear; we cannot act at all till then. A man’s acts are slavish, not true but specious, his very thoughts are false, he thinks as a slave and coward, till he have got fear under his feet.”

—THOMAS CARLYLE (1795–1881)

Video Example 4.3

In this video, a social worker discusses working with immigrants who are fearful of family members getting “picked up by [immigration officers].” What are her concerns about how these fears affect the larger community? What does the mentor social worker recommend in response to these concerns? How do these issues relate to the current context of immigration in the United States?

Spanglish?

Many commonly used words in American English are direct or slightly modified borrowings from the Spanish language. Many place names come from Spanish, including cities such as San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Santa Fe, and states such as Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Montana, and Nevada. This list includes just a few of the many Spanish contributions to American English: adios, adobe, amigo, bronco, burro, canyon, chili, cigar, coca, cola, coyote, guerrilla, hacienda, hombre, hurricane, lasso, loco, macho, mesquite, mosquito, padre, peon, pinto, plaza, poncho, ranch, rodeo, savvy, sombrero, vista.

Many Arizona legislators argued that Spanish-speaking immigrants were not learning English fast enough, were not assimilating to our culture, and were changing American culture from Anglo to Spanish. Although the Census Bureau reports that 78 percent of Hispanic Americans tend to speak Spanish even if they can speak English, 83 percent of Hispanic high school students

spoke English fluently, a higher rate than for high school students whose parents spoke another language at home (Ryan, 2013). Although Latinos are more likely than other immigrants to maintain their native language, immigrant groups in the past, such as Germans, Italians, Chinese, Jews, and Japanese, established schools so their children would maintain their native language and culture. It is true that Latinos have changed American society, influencing music, entertainment, literature, business, scholarly activity, and even the English language (see the “Spanglish” box). Mexican cuisine can be found everywhere, and salsa recently surpassed ketchup as the most popular American condiment. Yet previous immigrant groups have also altered American culture by the influence of their native cuisine, language, and creativity. This has never meant that immigrants were not assimilating to American culture; all immigrant groups have always contributed to the American economy.

How do immigrants today contribute to the American economy?

Since undocumented workers are the focus of most anti-immigrant hostility, it may be useful to begin with the role they play in our economy. Of the estimated 11.2 million undocumented workers in the United States, one million work in restaurants; they also represent 58 percent of all farm workers and 15 percent of all construction workers (Dubose, 2013). Although they are only about 5.2 percent of the workforce, undocumented workers pay billions in sales taxes; in 2010 they paid over $1 billion in income taxes (Dubose, 2013). They pay state income taxes ranging from $2 million (Montana) to $3 billion (California), and 75 percent of undocumented workers pay into social security to fund benefits that they are not likely ever to receive (Soergel, 2016). Anti-immigrant leaders still insist that illegal immigrants are getting services such as welfare and health care that deplete resources of state and local governments, but this claim was debunked two decades ago by a University of California, Davis, study reporting that the majority of undocumented workers do not enroll in government assistance programs because (1) they are not adequately fluent in English, (2) they are not aware of such programs, and (3) they fear that they will be detained by authorities and deported (Ramos, 2002).

Shorris (2001) has argued that all immigrants, especially illegal immigrants, have contributed to the U.S. economy by taking: “the worst of jobs, the ugly work, the dangerous work, the backbreaking debilitating work, the jobs that even the jobless reject” (p. 272). These jobs range from cultivating and harvesting mushrooms in damp caves to doing fieldwork as contract laborers

(digging onions, picking beans, or harvesting other fruits and vegetables) to working in manufacturing sweatshops for Third World wages. Despite complaints about illegal immigrants, it is questionable if Americans would be willing to pay the price, literally, if they were absent. (See Figure 4.4.)

One of the most significant ways that all immigrants have contributed to the U. S. economy can be observed in urban areas. As the twenty-first century began, scholars were making dire predictions that America's urban areas were likely to be enmeshed in a downward economic spiral, but except for a few cities such as Detroit, the majority of cities continued to thrive. One compelling argument to explain this phenomenon was the impact of immigrants on these metropolitan areas. By the turn of the century, cities with declining populations began to report increased numbers of immigrants. This increase in population was accompanied by an increase in vitality, especially in cities with the largest increase in the numbers of immigrants. A 2014 study found that immigration to New York City not only increased the population but also resulted in fewer vacant or abandoned buildings and revitalization of the local economy. This outcome is consistent with the "broken windows" theory from the early 1980s that said vacant or abandoned buildings were a sign of neighborhood decline or disorder and encouraged crime, but by occupying vacant housing, immigrants sent a different message about the vitality of these neighborhoods. In Chicago, many immigrants settled along the 26th Street corridor, which has evolved into an economically dynamic area that has benefited native-born people as well as immigrants (Sampson, 2015).

One of the myths associated with immigrants is that large concentrations of immigrant populations would result in more crime, but the crime rate is lower in areas with large immigrant populations. In urban areas in general, violent crimes such as murder have declined to the levels reported in the 1960s or earlier. Experts have argued that low crime rates for cities with high immigrant populations were not an accident but were a consequence of a "selection bias" that occurred because "most immigrants, Mexicans in particular, selectively migrate to the United States based on characteristics that predispose them to low crime, such as motivation to work and ambition" (Sampson, 2015, p. 23). In addition, recent immigrants born outside the United States are likely to be law-abiding to avoid the being deported. By 2015, there were 40 million foreign-born people living in the United States, and evidence suggests that their presence played a significant role in the decrease of urban crime rates. For example, in a Chicago study, researchers reported that first generation immigrants were 45 percent less likely to be

involved in violent crime, and their rates of violence were significantly lower than either Black or White people (Sampson, 2015).

Studies show that these lower crime rates benefit native-born urban Americans as well. New York City was ranked as one of the safest cities in America, and in Los Angeles, increased immigration in the 1990s was accompanied by a 45 percent decline in number of homicides—and the same occurred in other cities with large Latino populations (e.g., Dallas, Chicago, San Jose, and Phoenix). Cities near the border that have a history of large immigrant populations (especially Latinos), such as San Diego and El Paso, have been low-crime areas for many years. As cities became safer, life expectancy rates were affected. From 1990 to 2010, the life-expectancy rate for Black men increased by 7.3 years, and the White male life expectancy increased by 3.8 years. In addition, the pregnancy rate for teenagers declined by 56 percent for Black females and 45 percent for White females. Finally, as the cities became more economically dynamic, poverty rates were reduced. From 2000 to 2010, poverty increased to a greater degree in the suburbs than in the cities (Sampson, 2015). Despite all of this evidence, anti-immigrant advocates have continued to argue that a concentrated immigrant population in urban areas leads to increased crime as well as other negative myths about immigrants.

What myths about immigrants do many Americans believe?

Myths about “foreigners” who legally or illegally enter the United States have fueled negative attitudes for decades. Many Americans have continued to express anti-immigrant sentiments openly, and immigrants and their children have been affected by these prejudices (Costello, 2015). Although most myths about immigration refer to all immigrants, some refer specifically to immigrants with refugee status. According to the United Nations, a refugee is an individual “unable or unwilling to return to his or her country because of a well-founded fear of persecution . . . based on race, religion, nationality, or membership in a particular social group or political party” (Pipher, 2002, p. 18). The following myths illustrate current nativist attitudes about immigrants and refugees.

MYTH #1:

Immigrants arrive penniless, with very little formal education and immediately have to go on welfare.

The reality is that many immigrants were professionals in their country of origin—doctors, professors, and engineers. Although the figure varies each

year, 33 percent of U.S. immigrants had a college degree in 2011 (Ji, & Batalova, 2013). Yet, those arriving with graduate degrees may have to take minimum wage jobs because professional organizations or institutions in the United States may not recognize their skills or degrees, forcing them to return to school to be certified or retrained in related fields. Despite issues of language and culture, the percentage of immigrants, including refugees, receiving welfare is approximately the same as for natives, and studies of modern immigrants to the United States document that they rarely become permanent recipients of public assistance (Fitz, Wolgin, & Oakford, 2013).

“All the people like us are We. And everyone else is They.”

—RUDYARD KIPLING (1865–1936)

Immigrants pay rent and buy groceries and other products that help strengthen the economy. Most studies of the economic impact of immigrants report that they ultimately benefit local economies, even taking into account the services that may be required to assist them during their first few years in the country. With regard to undocumented immigrants, they are not eligible to receive most forms of public assistance beyond admitting their children to public schools or to the emergency room of a hospital, but they do pay taxes. As noted earlier, illegal undocumented immigrants contribute approximately $7 billion each year to Social Security, and since they can never claim this money, it will be used to fund the benefits of other workers in the Social Security system (Scherr, 2008).

MYTH #2:

Immigrants cling to their culture, language, and traditions, and refuse to assimilate into the American “melting pot.”

New immigrants have always maintained their cultural heritage, in part because their identity has been profoundly shaped by their native culture. When immigrant children become adults, they typically integrate their cultural heritage with American culture, producing a hybrid of traditions and values taken from both. As for learning English, it is not unusual to find that immigrants are multilingual when they arrive; often English is one of the languages they know. Baron (2000) observed that some Americans appear to equate bilingualism with a lack of patriotism.

Immigrants pay taxes, send children to schools, serve in the military, and are affected by local political decisions. Recent immigrants have demonstrated their desire to be actively engaged in our democratic society by participating

in voter registration efforts and transporting voters to the polls for elections. Because the Constitution leaves the issue of voting qualifications up to the local government, some cities have responded by giving voting rights to immigrants who are not yet citizens. The assimilation of immigrants is further complicated by a backlog of individuals pursuing naturalization—the caseload has increased by twice as much in the last fifteen years. The recent dramatic increase in unaccompanied children illegally crossing the border (mentioned earlier) has made the backlog problem even worse (Becerra, 2014).

MYTH #3:

The United States is taking more than its fair share of immigrants; other countries need to take more.

This myth promotes the belief that we have more immigrants that ever before, but in 1900, 34.5 percent of residents in the United States were first- or second-generation immigrants compared to 2012, when they constituted only 24.5 percent (Hanes, 2013). In terms of sheer numbers, it is true that the United States takes in more immigrants than any other country, and currently has 40 million foreign-born residents (including an estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants). First-generation immigrants constitute 12 percent of our population, but in many European countries, immigrants represent more than 10 percent. In Germany, this percentage is predicted to rise to 30 percent by 2030. In accepting immigrants as a percent of population, the United States ranks low in the world, with the list of countries accepting more immigrants including Canada, Australia, Germany, and Switzerland (Ozimek, 2012). The major difference between the United States and other countries is that more diverse groups are admitted to the United States.

People who express concerns about an excess of immigrants to the United States often refer specifically to Mexicans, but although 12 million immigrants have come from Mexico, 18.5 million have come from other nations (Hanes, 2013). Many Americans have demanded restrictions on Mexican immigration and more money for Border Patrol agents to keep out illegal immigrants. Although Mexican immigration has significantly decreased since the 2008 recession, those who come tend to stay. Beginning in the 1990s, increased border scrutiny resulted in a dramatic decline in the numbers of legal Mexican immigrants returning to Mexico for fear they would not be allowed reentry.

MYTH #4:

The main problem with U.S. immigration is the large number of illegal immigrants getting into the country.

Illegal immigrants make up 20 percent of the immigrant population and about 2 percent of the U.S. population. Although most U.S. immigrants come from Mexico, since 2007 there has been a drastic reduction in the number of undocumented immigrants entering the United States and far fewer legal Mexican immigrants since 2010 (Papademetriou, 2013). The stereotype of illegal immigrants is that of Mexicans illegally crossing the border, but over 41 percent of illegal immigrants entered the United States legally, often recruited by employers, and only become illegal by remaining after their work visas have expired.

The United States has a visa waiver program for residents of 36 selected countries, mostly in Western Europe, whose citizens can come to America for up to 90 days if they buy a round-trip travel ticket. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) reports that many people who come with such visas stay beyond the 90-day limit, becoming illegal immigrants (Seminara, 2013).

MYTH #5:

Illegal immigrants are responsible for increased crime, disease, and terrorism in the United States.

This allegation appeared in a 34-page booklet on illegal immigration published by the American Legion and disseminated to its nearly three million members (Scherr, 2008). It included the false assertion that illegal immigrants infected more than 7000 Americans with leprosy, even though this myth had already been proven false through investigations by many sources, including the news program 60 Minutes. The source of the claim that immigrants were bringing various diseases into the United States was an article written by a lawyer with a history of anti-immigrant attitudes and no medical expertise. According to Scherr (2008), there is no medical research reporting an increase in the numbers of Americans with diseases stemming from the presence of immigrants.

As for the myth about immigrants engaging in criminal acts, a New York Times article claimed that 21 percent of all crime in the United States was committed by undocumented workers; however, when the author of the article was confronted with evidence of errors in his interpretation of the

data, he corrected his calculations and reduced his estimate to 6.1 percent (Wilson, 2008). In addition, estimates of criminal behavior often come from data about people in prisons; many immigrants are in prison for violating immigration laws, not for violent crimes. As Wilson (2008) reported, research on criminal activities over several decades has consistently concluded that: “Immigrants aren’t a crime problem” (p. 21). Finally, with regard to the terrorism aspect of this myth, Scherr (2008) cited a Nixon Center study that found this allegation to be patently false, concluding that “not a single (terrorist) entered from Mexico” (p. 34).

MYTH #6:

Immigrants are taking jobs away from Americans.

The total number of legal and unauthorized immigrants is slightly more than 17 percent of the American workforce, about 12 percent and 5 percent, respectively. Despite the widespread belief that both categories of immigrants are taking jobs away from American workers, a Pew Research Center report finds that immigrants are not the dominant group in any occupation but are spread out over a number of different occupations, and the jobs where their numbers are the largest are jobs with low wages and few or no benefits that most American don’t want. For example, immigrants constitute about one-third of textile workers and one fifth of food preparation and servers. Immigrants also comprise about 45 percent of those working in private households in jobs ranging from a child’s nanny to a housekeeper to a gardener, and almost half of these workers are unauthorized immigrants. Unauthorized immigrants tend to be found among a narrower range of occupations than legal immigrants, making up 60 percent of agricultural workers and 60 percent of employees (pedicurists, etc.) who provide personal appearance services (DeSilver, 2017).

For as long as there has been immigration, business owners have insisted that immigration is necessary to sustain U.S. economic growth. Kugler and Oakford (2013) cite research reporting that immigrants and native workers usually have different skills and compete for different jobs, and that as immigration increases, the number of jobs being moved overseas decreases, keeping manufacturing jobs in our economy. In addition, immigrant entrepreneurs increase American jobs. Partnership for a New American Economy (2013) reported that the number of Hispanic immigrants who became entrepreneurs increased by 71.5 percent from 2000 to 2010, and they had a significant impact on employment. In 2012, one in ten Mexican immigrants was an entrepreneur. These studies illustrate why immigrants are

an asset to our economy; more Americans need to recognize the immediate and potential benefits of a culturally and linguistically diverse citizenry.

Self-Check 4.3 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of how the actions of some individuals and organizations reflect negative attitudes toward immigrants, how immigrants have contributed to the American economy, and the debunking of persistent myths about contemporary immigrants.

Attitudes toward Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

Cultural and linguistic diversity have evolved in human societies around the world, and each manifestation of a distinctive culture and language illustrates the complexity and richness of human creativity. Although human beings occupy the same planet, each language demonstrates how diverse groups interpret and understand their world; the differences between languages reveal that despite our similarities, human beings tend to see that world in distinctive ways. The four languages spoken by the most people in our world are Mandarin Chinese (over 1 billion), English (1 billion), Spanish (500 million), and Hindustani (490 million), but over 200 languages today are spoken by more than a million people (KryssTal, 2010). These different worldviews provide a dynamic perspective on human beings accommodating to diverse environments.

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) defines linguistic diversity as “the range of variation exhibited by human language” (p. 70), and she reports that there are between 6500 and 10,000 languages throughout the world, as well as a number of different sign language systems. A more precise estimate is impossible because so many languages are disappearing. In the United States alone there used to be more than 300 indigenous languages, but only 154 still remain, and many are becoming extinct. The Tuscarora were once part of the powerful alliance known as the Six Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, but when 93-year-old Helen Sater died in a Canadian hospital, she was the last living person fluent in the Tuscarora language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Linguists have identified 43 indigenous languages that are on the verge of extinction, and they fear that only three of them will survive: Cree, Ojibway, and Inuktitut (Crawford, 2000). With over 300 indigenous languages already present and with the arrival of people speaking diverse European languages, the history of North America should be regarded as an ongoing chronicle of communities that were multilingual as well as multicultural. Even today, the reality of linguistic diversity in the United

States can best be appreciated by visiting urban classrooms; yet Americans continue to be ambivalent about linguistic and cultural diversity.

Why should immigrants maintain their native language?

According to Ryan (2013), 21 percent of all K–12 students in the United States currently come from a home where a language other than English is spoken. Although more than two thirds of these students are Spanish-speaking, the following list includes other languages spoken by children in U.S. schools:

Southeast Asia: Hmong, Khmer, Lao, and Vietnamese

South Asia: Hindi, Punjabi, and Urdu

Asia: Cantonese, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, and Russian

Europe: Armenian, French, Polish, Portuguese, and Serbo-Croatian

Other: Arabic, Haitian Creole, Tagalog, and Navajo

Some Americans argue that immigrants and their children should not be encouraged to maintain fluency in their native languages but should focus on learning English and assimilating into American society. They often cite nations such as Canada, the former Yugoslavia, India, or the former Soviet Union to illustrate their concern that social disruptions can occur when groups within a nation maintain their cultural and linguistic heritage, but based on his review of history, Baron (2000) found that: “where multilingualism has produced civil strife . . . (it) invariably occurs when minority-language rights are suppressed” (p. 451). Some Americans also believe that it is normal for a nation’s citizens to be monolingual, yet most individuals in the world today are either bilingual or multilingual. As we began the twenty-first century, Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) noted that those of us who were monolingual were the abnormal ones.

A primary motivation for maintaining your native language is to preserve your sense of identity and ability to function within a linguistic community. The parents that Olivera (2012) interviewed wanted their children to become bilingual and bicultural so that they could communicate with family members and participate in cultural celebrations in their community. In addition, an individual’s identity is often grounded in religious faith. Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) has described the intimate relationship between language and religion, finding that people who have learned to pray in their native language have established their sense of connection to their God in a way

that often makes it difficult for them to pray in their second language. Despite many reasons for maintaining a native language, most immigrants in the United States tend to learn English and cease to be fluent in their native language.

Why do immigrants tend to lose their native language?

In contrast to American fears concerning the failure of immigrants to learn English and assimilate into American culture, studies document a pattern of the loss of linguistic diversity in subsequent generations of immigrant families. Jody Vallejo, a sociology scholar who studies immigration, described the pattern of language loss: (1) the first-generation immigrants learn enough English to function in society but prefer to speak their native language, (2) the second generation becomes fluent in English and maintains fluency in speaking their native language, and (3) the third generation tends to only be fluent in English (Mejina, 2016). Rodriguez (2013) confirms Vallejo's description with a Pew study finding that third-generation Latino families are English-dominant, meaning that they listen to English-speaking television programs and music, and they think in English. Because of ongoing immigration, demographers predict that the number of Spanish speakers in the United States is likely to reach 40 million by 2020. Yet of all Latinos living in the United States at that date, it is predicted that only two-thirds of them will speak Spanish fluently, compared to three-quarters of Latinos today (Rodriguez, 2013). Paradoxically, while Latinos are losing fluency in Spanish, non-Latino parents are lobbying for bilingual education, especially dual immersion programs. Schools offering such programs introduce students to Spanish throughout their elementary school years with the goal of producing students who are fluent in both speaking and writing.

The United States is not the only nation whose immigrants lose their language. It is happening in other Western nations where the dominant group (speaking English or French or German) demands that immigrants abandon their own language and heritage and adopt the language and cultural traditions of the dominant group. This can be most clearly seen in the education of immigrant children. After describing this form of assimilation that demands cultural and language conformity, Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) concludes: "This is the preferred Western strategy in the education of ethnic minority children. It amounts to linguistic genocide" (p. 174). Some educators in the United States and elsewhere have been sensitive to this issue and have advocated a different approach.

What alternative pedagogical strategy have American educators proposed?

Beginning in the 1960s, numerous activist groups, including Chicano, Puerto Rican, Asian American, and Native American people, addressed educational issues such as segregation, inadequate resources, and the need for bilingual/bicultural programs (Bale, 2015). These grassroots groups were effective enough to get the attention of Congress, which passed the Bilingual Education Act in 1968, but even the advocates for this bill did not share the same rationale for supporting it as the activist groups. The bill's chief sponsor, Ralph Yarborough (D-Texas), offered this argument to his Senate colleagues:

It is not the purpose of this bill to create pockets of different languages throughout the country. It is the main purpose of the bill to bring millions of school children into the mainstream of American life and make them literate in the national language of the country in which they live: namely, English (Crawford, 2000, p. 88).

Yarborough made this argument to convince his Senate colleagues that this bill would serve the needs of Mexican Americans like those in his district where adults with limited English skills tried to find jobs while their children struggled to learn English. He portrayed the Bilingual Education Act as an anti-poverty program for a constituency he believed largely had been overlooked in other "Great Society" programs. The politicians who passed this bill viewed bilingual education not as a way to achieve bilingualism but as a more effective means of encouraging assimilation. If students learned better by teaching them in Spanish, then some instruction could be delivered in Spanish so that students would not fall behind in their content learning. The assumption was that bilingual education was a transitional program that would temporarily maintain fluency in a native language until the student's English skills were sufficient to allow all instruction to be in English.

Many advocates for bilingual education disagreed with this interpretation, arguing that students had a right to maintain not only their native language but also their cultural heritage while they learned English and adapted to their new culture. These advocates, including students and parents, effectively challenged their local school districts to address their concerns, especially their desire for bilingual/bicultural education. These issues were dramatized in 1968 when thousands of Chicano/a students walked out of East Los Angeles schools and in 1969 when students in Crystal City, Texas, boycotted their schools. As Bale (2015) noted, "It was the conscious, ambitious, and collective actions of anti-racist activists that brought real change to schools for emergent bilingual youth" (p. 23).

In the early 1970s, Massachusetts and several other states repealed their English Only laws and established programs for “transitional bilingual education,” but before the end of the decade, the findings of a nationwide study disturbed many Americans when it reported that 86 percent of bilingual programs retained Spanish-speaking students after they had become fluent in English (Crawford, 2000). In 1978, Congress voted to allow federal funds to be used only for “transitional” bilingual education programs. Another study reported that half of bilingual teachers were not proficient in students’ native languages, raising doubts about whether bilingual programs could produce students who were as fluent in English as they were in their native language. In 1980, a report by the President’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies encouraged advocates for bilingual education by stating: “The melting pot tradition that denigrates immigrants’ maintenance of their skills to speak their native tongue still lingers, and unfortunately causes linguistic minorities (in the U.S.) to be ignored as a potential asset” (Tse, 2001, p. 51).

Yet doubts continued to plague bilingual education programs, and early research did not diminish these doubts. By the end of the 1980s, Shorris (2001) described numerous conflicting studies that reported findings both supportive and critical of bilingual education. Increasingly, critics of bilingual education portrayed it as a language-maintenance program rather than as a way for children of immigrants to learn English and academic content more effectively. In the midst of this debate, the Reagan administration funded the implementation of English-only approaches for students learning English as a second language (Crawford, 2000).

As the controversy continued, it became obvious that this was not simply an educational debate, but that there were social and political aspects as well. Advocates for bilingual education were interested in more than language learning; they argued for the value of teaching diverse “viewpoints, histories, sociopolitical realities and languages, and to promote the intrinsic worth of diversity in general” (Gort, 2005, p. 34). Opponents were adamant that such goals went beyond the original mandate of helping non-English-speaking students to learn English, and they criticized bilingual programs for separating their students from their peers in the regular classes, isolating them from interactions with these students that might enable their assimilation into American society. Critics of bilingual education became increasingly successful in persuading Americans that bilingual education programs were not working.

By the 1990s, many Americans believed that bilingual education was more likely to promote students' maintenance of their native language and culture than it was to foster their learning English and assimilating into American society, even though ongoing research began to make a stronger case for the efficacy of bilingual education programs. Salas (2006) cited a number of studies finding that students whose first language was not English achieved more academic progress in English when they also had instruction in their first language. Salas also referred to a review of research on bilingual education programs concluding that students in these programs "do as well as or better on standardized tests than students in comparison groups of English-learners in English-only programs" (p. 34). Still, the five million English Language Learners (ELLs) in K–12 public schools today are unlikely to be enrolled in bilingual programs because the federal Bilingual Education Act was not renewed in 2002.

Have research studies identified effective approaches to ELL instruction?

English-only programs have often involved a total immersion approach in which only English is spoken in the classroom, yet advocates can produce no credible studies of support, usually offering anecdotal evidence. By contrast, there are numerous studies documenting the diverse outcomes achieved in bilingual education programs. According to the U. S. Department of Education, there were only 260 dual-language schools in 2000, but by 2017 there were over 2000 dual-language schools, and states like Texas, Utah, and North Carolina had passed laws promoting such schools. The increasing popularity of dual-language schools stems from the combination of scientific and pedagogical research, as studies that report on student academic achievement and neurological research clearly support this approach (Peterson, 2017). In 2006, the National Literacy Panel published its review of research on programs educating ELLs, and in that same year the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence published its review of these programs. Literacy expert Claude Goldenberg of Stanford University engaged in a meta-analysis of these two major reviews of literacy studies to determine what conclusions could be reached.

Goldenberg (2008) began by providing some demographic data: Of the five million ELLs in U.S. schools, 80 percent were Spanish-speaking. Approximately 60 percent of ELLs received some form of English-only instruction. Test results revealed that ELLs tended to have low scores on measures of academic achievement, but there was no way of knowing if these scores reflected poor content knowledge or simply the limitations of

the students' proficiency in English. Yet Goldenberg (2008) reported that one of the major findings emerging from both studies was that "Teaching students to read in their first language promotes higher levels of reading achievement in English" (p. 14). He also noted that this finding was consistent with four previous meta-analyses of research on ELLs and emphasized the historic significance of this finding: "No other area in educational research with which I am familiar can claim five independent meta-analyses based on experimental studies, much less five that converge on the same finding" (p. 15). Further, both research reviews reported that ELLs in bilingual education programs tended to develop sufficient literacy skills to be not only fluent in speaking two languages but also fluent in reading and writing in both languages.

For those students who achieve such fluency, educators should be encouraging them to enroll in college. Liou (2016) interviewed numerous immigrant students and found that all of them expressed a desire to enroll in a college, but not one had been encouraged by a teacher or guidance counselor to pursue this goal. Instead, studies have found that educators have low expectations for immigrant children, even when those children's parents have high expectations for them. A 2015 study found that immigrant students were the fastest growing population in America's K–12 public schools, yet they are being underserved, not because of any hostile attitudes but because educators tend to pity the immigrants as having limited options for their future (Liou, 2016). These immigrant children do face difficulties. Some were born in refugee camps and spent years without receiving any formal education. After arriving in the United States, often these children were crowded into apartments and took care of younger siblings. For that reason, when the immigrant children finally got the chance to attend school, many were grateful and prepared to work hard to improve their academic abilities. Instead of encouraging them, Liou (2016) reported teacher responses such as "They won't be able to make it. You're setting them up to fail," or "College isn't for everyone" (pp. 86–87). Advocates challenge teachers to have much higher expectations for immigrant students and to employ strategies that affirm student abilities and identities and provide these students with the support and mentoring that will promote their academic achievement.

Why should educators be advocates for bilingual programs?

As the global economy becomes increasingly important for our national economy, it is an advantage for any nation to have citizens fluent in one or

more languages other than their native tongue. The U.S. government has understood this advantage for decades. Since 1946, when it was first established, the largest foreign language school in the United States has been the Defense Language Institute for military and government personnel. Tse (2001) probably had the Defense Language Institute in mind as she wrote the first of her three arguments describing the advantages of increasing the number of Americans who are bilingual or multilingual:

Diplomacy/security—having fluent speakers of the world's languages enables the United States to play a major role in global affairs and negotiate peaceful solutions to political conflicts. Bilingual Americans also strengthen our ability to gather credible intelligence with regard to issues affecting our national security.

Economic—because of globalization, businesses increasingly need employees who not only can speak another language but also can understand the culture in which the language is spoken. Businesses that are able to navigate the linguistic and cultural terrain will be able to establish better relations with trading partners around the world.

Educational—promoting bilingualism in our children and youth will increase the numbers of college students majoring in a language, and that will likely result in increasing the numbers of bilingual students choosing to enroll in teacher training courses. For many years now, it has often been difficult for K–12 schools to find teachers who are both fluent in another language and have teaching certification.

For all of these reasons, educators who are advocates for bilingualism may be more successful today if they renew their efforts to implement bilingual education programs in K–12 schools. There are various forms of bilingual education, but both students and parents have had high praise for the dual language approach (also known as two-way immersion). Dual language programs pair ELLs with students who want to learn another language in the same classroom. A bilingual teacher may provide instruction in two languages, and the students serve as resources for one another. In a program with Spanish-speaking students, the students learning Spanish use their ELL peers as language tutors, and ELLs use their partners to tutor them in English. The growing need in the world, especially in the United States, for linguistic diversity and cultural competence should be the catalyst for

Americans developing a more pluralistic attitude toward the value of diverse languages and cultures.

Application Exercise 4.1

This video depicts how educators can affirm the language that students bring to school. Review the video and complete the activity.

Self-Check 4.4 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of attitudes toward the cultural and linguistic diversity of the United States and which educational approaches have been most effective for learning English.

Afterword

The history of immigration demonstrates that there have been and still are diverse but clearly defined attitudes toward immigration on the part of American citizens, political leaders, and representatives of business and industry. Although workers sometimes resent the economic competition, our society has benefited from the labor of immigrant workers. We have also benefited from the cultural diversity of immigrants from so many different nations. History teaches us that there is no royal road for immigrants trying to adjust or adapt to a new culture; in reality, there are diverse pathways. Each immigrant may take a different route, but if they remain in the United States, each will likely end at the same destination—becoming an American.

“America, it would seem, is miraculously both singular and plural, organized and scattered, united and diffused.”

Summary

Because British colonists were trying to recreate the Old World in the New World, they were not receptive to immigrants from cultures that were not of Anglo Saxon origin.

The anti-immigrant ideology of Nativism rejected Catholics and all immigrants perceived as radical, and nativists engaged in political activities to control them.

The eugenics movement in the past and the English Only movement today are examples of organizations that have fueled anti-immigrant sentiment that has resulted in a variety of hostile actions toward immigrants; despite the documented contributions that immigrants make to the American economy, Americans continue to believe negative myths about current immigrants.

Although the United States is still a monolingual society, many recent immigrants are promoting bilingualism, and studies have shown that bilingual education is not only the best way to learn English but also the most effective way to preserve native language and culture.

Terms and Definitions

AmericanizationThe demand that immigrants to the United States reject their ethnic or cultural heritage and conform to American ways as defined by the dominant group

Anti-SemitismHaving anti-Jewish prejudices or stereotypes, or engaging in discrimination against Jewish people

AssimilationA process whereby immigrants adopt cultural traits of the host country in order to be identified with that country and integrated into the immediate society

AsylumA safe place; a shelter from danger (pertaining to refugees)

English OnlyA movement in various states demanding that legislatures make English the official language of the state, with the eventual goal of having the federal government make English the official language of the United States

EugenicsThe study of agencies under social control that may improve or repair the racial qualities of future generations, either physically or mentally (Lynn, 2001)

Linguistic diversityThe range of variation exhibited by human language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000)

NativismAn anti-immigrant ideology advocating the protection of “native” inhabitants of a country from new or potential immigrants who are viewed as threatening or dangerous (Feagin & Feagin, 1996)

OppressionWhen any entity (society, organization, group, or individual) intentionally or unintentionally distributes resources inequitably, refuses to share power, imposes ethnocentric culture, and/or maintains unresponsive and inflexible institutions toward another entity for its supposed benefit and rationalizes its actions by blaming or ignoring the victim (Andrzejewski, 1996)

RefugeeAn individual “unable or unwilling to return to his or her country because of a well-founded fear of persecution . . . based on race, religion, nationality, or membership in a particular social group or political party” (Pipher, 2002)

XenophobiaFear of or prejudice against people from other nations

Discussion Exercises

Exercise #1 Believing in Myths

Directions: Chapter Four described myths about immigrants, including the following:

They arrive penniless, with very little formal education, and immediately go on welfare.

They cling to their culture, language, and traditions, and refuse to assimilate into the American “melting pot.”

A large percentage of them are illegal.

They are taking jobs away from Americans.

In discussing these myths, start by identifying which ones you once thought were true and why you thought them. Then discuss what made you realize they were not true. Conclude by identifying which myth does the most damage in promoting negative attitudes toward immigrants, and explain why.

Chapter 5

Race and Oppression

Learning Outcome

After reading this chapter you will know and be able to:

5.1 Describe potential benefits in indigenous cultures, and explain the ongoing significance of treaties and contemporary issues affecting Native Americans.

5.2 Discuss resistance to slavery in the United States, and describe the struggle of Black people after the Civil War to attain their civil rights as American citizens.

5.3 Describe and give examples of the historic hostility toward Asian immigrants, and explain how the model minority myth recognizes Asian American achievements while still stereotyping the group.

5.4 Identify and discuss the diverse Latino groups that have immigrated to the United States, and give examples of the different obstacles each group has encountered.

The categorizing of human beings into racial groups has resulted in a history of racial oppression in America, beginning with the colonial period and continuing as rebellion against England created a new nation. Although all immigrants to the United States encountered obstacles and opposition, being perceived as White initially or eventually proved an enormous advantage. Whether they came voluntarily as immigrants or were brought involuntarily as slaves, people of color had to contend with oppression. Some of these experiences were similar for all groups, but other forms of oppression were unique to each particular group.

“Everyone likes to give as well as to receive. No one wishes only to receive all the time. We have taken much from your culture. I wish you had taken something from our culture for there were some good and beautiful things in it.”

—CHIEF DAN GEORGE (1899–1991)

The quotation from Chief Dan George describes a problem for indigenous people, those who were established in the New World, and all immigrants of color in their encounter with European colonists. Differences perceived as “race” were actually differences of culture, so by rejecting other races, the

majority was actually rejecting the cultural gifts each group could have shared. Diversity in the United States began with the Native Americans, with most of the nations having egalitarian social structure when Europeans first arrived. Men and women performed different tasks, but no task was considered inferior to another. All work was necessary for the good of all (Lajimodiere, 2013).

Historical Benefits of Native American Cultures and Contemporary Issues

The Arawaks were one of more than 500 nations of indigenous people in the Americas when Columbus “discovered” a Caribbean island he called Hispaniola. After a brief period of peaceful relations, Columbus’s crew kidnapped a number of Arawaks to auction as slaves in Spain. When most of them died on the voyage back to Spain, Columbus looked for other ways to profit when he returned. Noticing gold jewelry worn by Arawaks, Columbus told them to bring him gold. They insisted that there was only a little gold on the island, but Columbus demanded gold and warned them not to return without it. If any Arawaks came back empty-handed, Columbus had his men cut off their hands as punishment to intimidate the rest into complying (Zinn, 2003). Although historians cannot give a precise number for the population of indigenous people living in North America in 1492, their best estimate is that the number probably exceeded ten million people. By the 1920 Census, there were less than 100,000 American Indians left (Cox, 2015). According to Josephy (2005), Europeans exterminated half of the 500 nations and nearly eradicated the cultures of many Indian nations that managed to survive.

What did Europeans learn from Native Americans?

English settlers in America tended to build on existing Native American settlements and walked on Native American paths, many of which eventually became the roads of the new nation. Benjamin Franklin studied the governance structure of the Iroquois League and borrowed heavily from it to create his “Albany Plan,” the basis for the Articles of Confederation that was the first form of government implemented in the United States (Weatherford, 1988). Even though he borrowed ideas from the Iroquois League, Franklin’s prejudice against Indians appears in a letter to James Parker:

It would be a very strange Thing, if six Nations of ignorant Savages should be capable of forming a Scheme for such an Union and be able to execute it in such a Manner, as that it has subsisted for Ages, and appears indissoluble; and yet that a like Union should be impracticable for ten or a Dozen English Colonies, to whom it is more necessary. (Le May, 1987, p. 444)

Unlike Franklin, most colonists did not care to learn from Native Americans. Their goal was to establish the culture and traditions of their own European heritage in America. Ethnocentrism is the belief that your own race, nation, or culture is superior to all others, as illustrated by colonial choices for settlement names. Dutch settlers called their town New Amsterdam until the English captured it and renamed it New York. Many settlements were named without even adding the term new, which can be seen by comparing city names on current maps of New England states with city names on maps of England. English colonists called a bird a robin because it reminded them of an English robin. We still call this bird a robin today, but it's not an English robin, nor is it related to the English robin (Williams, 1954).

What's in a Name

Although the term Native American has become widely used, there is still not a consensus for a single term among native peoples. The only consensus is their preference to be identified by their tribal affiliation, such as Hopi, Apache, Sioux, Mohican, or Inuit. Author Sherman Alexei rejects the term Native American, preferring American Indian. Some prefer to be called indigenous people. In this chapter, all three terms are used to reflect this diversity of preferences. In conversations with individual Native Americans, the best option is to ask the individual what his or her preference is, and then use that term.

What were some of the cultural differences between European settlers and Native Americans?

Foods and medicines

European settlers did not want to eat food initially unfamiliar to them, such as potatoes, peanuts, corn, squash, tomatoes, peppers, and pumpkins. Later, these foods came to be exported around the world and had a major influence within countless nations. As Weatherford (1988) wrote, "It is difficult to imagine what Ireland would be today without the potato" (p. 64). Similarly, it is difficult to imagine what Italian food was like before the American tomato became part of its cuisine.

"God teaches the birds to make nests, yet the nests of all birds are not alike."

—DUWAMISH PROVERB

Europeans did not try to acquire the indigenous people's knowledge of medicinal properties of plants. (See Figure 5.1.) As an example, scurvy is a disease resulting from vitamin C deficiency, causing bleeding gums and fatigue; it often afflicted people voyaging on ships because fruit didn't last long at sea. Native Americans knew how to cure scurvy long before Europeans found a cure by noticing that German sailors on boats stocked with sauerkraut did not tend to get this illness (Weatherford, 1988). Suzuki and Knudtson (1992) estimate that 75 percent of prescription drugs derived from plants have been discovered based on clues stemming from the healing practices of the indigenous peoples of the world. According to Harvard botanist Richard Schultes, every time a shaman dies, "it is as if a library had burned down" (Gell-Mann, 1994, p. 339).

Figure 5.1 Kickapoo Sagwa Bottle

The use of Indian images on medicine bottles in the 1800s suggests that Americans were aware that Indians understood the medicinal value of plants.

Source: Kent Koppelman

Figure 5.1 Full Alternative Text

Hygiene

Native Americans practiced frequent bathing while Europeans did not. Europeans believed that exposing the body to the air could cause colds and other health problems. Christian church leaders also disapproved of public bathing, fearing that nude people mingling in a public bath might inspire lust. Instead, throughout Europe, many, including the aristocracy, would dry-rub themselves with sand, ashes, or pumice stone. For the rich or royal, perfume disguised body odor. According to Smith (2001), England's Queen Elizabeth I took a bath once a month, and Spain's Queen Isabella proudly claimed that she had only taken two baths in her life: when she was born and when she was married.

Governance and gender equality

Native American women who owned property maintained control of it regardless of their marital status (White, 2001). Women elders in clans often had the power to select tribal leaders, and they had a voice in important decisions. Some women even participated in battles. Among the Cherokee, such women were called "war women" and were given a place on the nation's governing council; Lakota women warriors constituted four military groups (Lajimodiere, 2013). In 1642, Virginians met with a Cherokee

delegation to negotiate for a peaceful resolution of their recent conflicts. As their leader approached the colonial delegation, he asked them why he saw no women. Hearing that the colonists had brought no women, the leader said he could not negotiate since the colonists did not have half of their people. Despite this historic reality about Indian women, Europeans created and disseminated stereotypes about them that persist today—both the negative stereotype portraying them as drudges who were restricted to domestic work and the “positive” stereotype of the Princess. The latter image pertained to Native American women saving or giving aid to others (Lajimodiere, 2013).

Childcare

Children of European immigrants, like children in Europe, were expected to work on domestic chores at an early age. If they misbehaved, they were punished severely with beatings and whippings to teach them obedience to parental authority, just as parents had to be obedient to their superiors. Children were rarely shown overt affection and were allowed little freedom. By contrast, European observers of American Indian societies were surprised by the amount of freedom given to Indian boys and girls. Young children were not expected to assist their parents with farming, hunting, or household tasks. There were few restrictions on their activities as they became intimately familiar with their surroundings. Instead of punishing with straps or rods, Native American children were scolded and made to feel a sense of shame about misbehaving. The parents’ goal was to promote a sense of personal pride and an independent, courageous spirit. They believed that threats and physical punishment would cause children to become passive and fearful (Mintz, 2004). European children who were captured and raised by Indians were called “White Indians.” Even if offered a chance to return to their families, some of these children refused to leave. When “White Indian” children were returned to colonial society, most preferred to return to their Indian families. Benjamin Franklin addressed this phenomenon in 1753 (Mintz, 2004):

When white persons of either sex have been taken prisoners young by the Indians, and lived awhile among them, tho’ ransomed by their Friends, and treated with all imaginable tenderness to prevail with them to stay among the English, yet in a Short time they become disgusted with our manner of life . . . and take the first good Opportunity of escaping again into the woods, from whence there is no reclaiming them. (p. 8)

Ecology

Native Americans have expressed the belief that human beings share a spiritual kinship with the natural world and are obligated to live in harmony with it. Suzuki and Knudtson (1992) cite a declaration by the Iroquois Confederacy deploring the destruction of forests by entrepreneurs, the depletion of wildlife by sports hunters and pesticides, the pollution of the air by factories, the pollution of water and poisoning of fish by industry and agribusiness, and the depositing of toxic wastes in chemical dumps across the country. The Iroquois declaration calls on people to preserve life around us, to "carry out our function as caretakers of the land" (pp. 240–241).

What was the main source of conflict between Europeans and American Indians?

The primary contention between European colonists and American Indians was about land ownership. In school, children are often taught that Columbus planted Spain's flag in the New World to claim the land for Spain, implying that Spanish and American Indian representatives would resolve the competing claims either by negotiating a treaty or by warfare. Engaging in war based on claims to land was common in European history. Nations gained or lost inhabited land through conquest because only uninhabited land could be claimed, a principle identified as vacuum domicilium (Berkhofer, 2004). Even in 1492, international law recognized the rights of indigenous people to own the land where they lived. Explorers were given charters to allow them to claim land under the legal principle of terra nullius, an ambiguous term suggesting lands without people but interpreted as including land inhabited by a people not possessing religions and customs equal to those of Europeans.

"Take only what you need and leave the land as you found it."

—ARAPAHO PROVERB

When Columbus planted the Spanish flag, he was establishing the legal right for Spain to possess uninhabited land or to purchase the land if indigenous people had a legitimate claim to it. But most legal claims for land inhabited by Native Americans were not made under the principle of vacuum domicilium because natives made it clear that the land where they lived belonged to them collectively, and they belonged to the land. To resolve the ambiguity of making a terra nullius claim, European nations wanting to take possession of Indian land created a new concept called occupatio bellica, referring to peaceful seizure of land underutilized by the indigenous people. Although indigenous people might not agree with what was viewed as

“underutilized,” the principle allowed Europeans to take possession of land by peaceful means, such as by erecting crosses marked with the royal seal throughout the land or by bribing a few indigenous individuals to sign an agreement conceding the land.

Nomads were the exception. Defined as “pastoral people” wandering on the land and never staying in one place, nomads were not granted a legal claim to land. In making land claims, colonists described indigenous people as “nomadic” because they would move their villages every few years because of soil depletion and decreasing crop productivity. After many years at another site, they might move again, eventually returning to a site abandoned decades before where the soil would now be replenished (Berkhofer, 2004). Such a pattern does not fit the definition of nomadic. Although Plains Indians, such as the Sioux or Cheyenne, were nomadic and followed historic migratory patterns, most indigenous people lived in villages. If villagers resisted encroachment on their land, the result was often armed conflict ending with a treaty mandating the loss of land and Indian resettlement.

“They made many promises, so many I can’t remember, but they only kept one. They promised to take our land, and they took it.”

—RED CLOUD (1822–1909)

Why are American Indian treaties still important today?

A treaty is a legal document negotiated between two (or more) sovereign nations involving terms of peace, trade, and other matters. American Indian treaties document the cession of American Indian lands to the U.S. government that were then made available for settlement. Land was also confiscated for resources. As described in Gedicks (1993), historian David Wrone has calculated that 19.5 million acres of land taken from just one indigenous group, the Chippewa, resulted in the United States gaining significant wealth. Besides taking possession of the land, the resources from the land included “100 billion board feet of timber; 150 billion tons of iron ore; 13.5 billion pounds of copper” (p. 51). Other resources taken from Indian land included water, ports, fish, fowl, and game, all contributing to a profitable tourism industry that has yielded considerable wealth to members of the dominant society who gained access as a result of treaties.

A treaty signed by an American Indian nation and the United States was an agreement between sovereign nations. Treaties were written with provisions to be maintained in perpetuity, yet the U.S. government has violated

virtually every treaty made with indigenous peoples, often during the lifetimes of those who signed the treaty (Josephy, 2005; Wilson, 1998). Yet treaties continue to be important documents because they affirm the status of Indian Sovereignty. Deloria (2001) described Indian Sovereignty as a principle affirming the legal right of American Indian nations to define themselves on their own terms and to behave as unique cultural and legal entities.

An ongoing controversy related to Indian Sovereignty was the announcement of the proposed Keystone pipeline that would carry oil from Canada to the Gulf Coast, crossing treaty land and sacred sites belonging to indigenous people. In April 2016, the Standing Rock Sioux established the Sacred Stone Camp in North Dakota, where they were joined by more than 300 nations of indigenous people to protest the pipeline. By December there were 2000 permanent camp residents and a population that rose as high as 10,000 on the weekends (Wolfe-Rocca, 2017). Other allies included farm families who were concerned about the risks to their precious water resource, the Nebraska aquifer. Supporters of the pipeline emphasized the value of increased oil supplies and the jobs the project would create, but critics pointed out that there was no oil shortage today, and only 35 permanent jobs would be created since most jobs would last for only the two years of construction (Baker & Davenport, 2017). Protest organizers told everyone who came to the Sacred Stone Camp that they could engage in only nonviolent activities such as demonstrations, ceremonies, and prayer meetings, but protestors were subjected pipeline security forces using tear gas, security dog attacks, and security forces firing on them with rubber bullets or spraying them with water hoses in subzero temperatures (Editors of Rethinking Schools, 2016–2017). On December 4, 2016, the Army Corps of Engineers denied permission to Energy Transfer Partners to build the proposed pipeline. In 2017, President Trump signed a series of executive orders allowing the Keystone pipeline to be built as well as a pipeline through North and South Dakota, another point of contention for American Indians and environmentalists (Baker & Davenport, 2017).

Why were American Indian treaties consistently violated?

The United States negotiated over 400 treaties with various American Indian nations. When treaties were signed, the land designated for indigenous people was often regarded as expendable; yet if the land became desirable, they were forced to surrender it. The Cherokee possessed legal deeds to Georgia land where they had built homes and businesses. When ordered to

go to Oklahoma territory, they took their case to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in their favor; however, President Andrew Jackson refused to enforce the ruling. In 1838, he ordered federal troops to march the Cherokee to Oklahoma, a journey now called the Trail of Tears because of numerous deaths that occurred on the way (Wallace, 1993).

Because of treaties, several American Indian nations were forced to occupy Oklahoma territory until demands for cheap land led the United States to renegotiate the treaties, restricting Indians in Oklahoma to the least desirable land and allowing settlers to claim the rest. Americans had little interest in American Indian land in Oklahoma—until oil was discovered. The treaty was renegotiated. Similarly, an 1868 Treaty of Fort Laramie declared that the Sioux would permanently retain lands sacred to them in the Black Hills—until gold was discovered. The treaty was renegotiated (Josephy, 2005; Wilson, 1998). This pattern has continued.

Many treaties signed over a century ago relegated American Indians to small reservations but affirmed their right to hunt and fish on tribal lands beyond reservation boundaries. For native people, being able to hunt and fish on former tribal land was a critical concession that may have seemed an innocuous benefit to the other side when the treaty was signed. As hunting and fishing became profitable tourism activities, complaints that the treaties should be abrogated or renegotiated have increased. People promoting outdoor recreational activities have protested Indian hunting and fishing privileges, even though the treaties guarantee them. Indigenous people have responded by insisting on maintaining the treaties and respecting their rights as sovereign nations.

One consequence of this history of treaty violations is that American Indians have historically been the most impoverished racial group in the United States, a fact reflected in health data. Health issues have plagued American Indians for a long time, but Pember (2015) highlights a new perspective from a 2014 report concluding that when earlier generations have struggled with a traumatic experience, their responses seem to have an effect on their genetic structure, making them more susceptible to future stress or trauma. Further, genetic research has found evidence supporting the concept of intergenerational trauma. One expert described this phenomenon as a process beginning with the experience of a significant trauma such as losing one’s homeland or one’s culture. Over time, victims’ negative responses, in terms of physical and psychological health, are passed on to subsequent generations, who manifest similar symptoms, contributing to such adverse

health conditions as diabetes, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder. Poor health is also reflected in longevity data, which reports that American Indians are more likely to die before reaching the age of 45 than members of any other racial or ethnic group in the United States (Cox, 2015).

What are other contemporary issues affecting Indigenous people?

Most students in American K–12 schools are not given much information about the cultures of American Indians, even when Native American students are in the school. The latter are likely to be affected by stereotype threat, which scholars say is a major factor contributing to the achievement gap between American Indian students and others (Warner, 2015). Schools need to provide accurate information about Native Americans, especially on the diversity of American Indian cultures, to debunk Indian stereotypes. The responsibility to provide accurate information about American Indians is mandated by social studies standards, but according to a Penn State Study of all 50 states, 87 percent of the references to American Indians in state academic standards pertain to Indians living in the nineteenth century (Editors of Rethinking Schools, 2016–2017). Warner (2015) cites studies finding that curricula in K–12 schools provide inadequate coverage of American Indians or no coverage at all. One study reported that in nine states where standards require content on American Indians, nearly all did not require content after the 1830s when many tribes were forced to relocate, leaving a final image of American Indians as powerless people being victimized. Such an image does not enhance the self-esteem of an American Indian student. Further, the disappearance of Native Americans from textbooks distorts history and makes Indian students feel invisible (Wolfe-Rocca, 2017).

Warner (2015) cites a review of American Indian representations in seven popular U.S. history textbooks that found two themes: the “dead and buried” approach and the “tourist” approach. The first portrays American Indians as existing primarily in the past with only brief references to contemporary events. Both approaches fail to address the diverse cultures of American Indian nations and current issues confronting them. Instead, any mention of contemporary Indians tended to focus on Indians living on reservations, even though they represent only 35 percent of indigenous people today. These accounts often replace older stereotypes with new stereotypes based on American Indians operating casinos. Only four states require content on contemporary American Indians from elementary school through high school, but outcomes vary widely based primarily on state funding. The best

outcome has been achieved in Montana, which passed a Constitutional mandate in 1999 entitled the Indian Education for All Act (IEFA), but it had to pursue a successful lawsuit to get appropriate funding in 2004 to implement the law (Constantin, 2015). Tribal leaders contributed to identifying "Essential Understandings" about American Indian history and culture, and scholars say a major factor in its success is that the knowledge was integrated into the curriculum rather than being offered as separate courses (Carjuzaa, Baldwin, & Munson, 2015). Another major factor in the success of IEFA was the presence of support specialists working with preservice teachers. The result is that American Indian students finally get to see people from their group portrayed accurately in their classrooms, and non-Indian students have an opportunity to understand a perspective different from their own. Other states are looking at Montana, and in 2015, Washington passed its version of IEFA (Constantin, 2015). However, we continue to be surrounded by American Indian stereotypes, such as the images used for sports teams, even in K–12 schools.

Many Native Americans and tribal councils have spoken out against these American Indian logos and mascots, saying they are racist and offensive and asking schools and colleges displaying such images to discontinue this practice. (See Figure 5.2.) Some people say that the mascots honor and respect a proud, fighting spirit, but that ignores the American Indians fighting to eliminate mascots because they are offensive. American Indian women are also trying to dispel their stereotypes by taking leadership roles in tribal governments, and both genders are increasingly pursuing careers in such areas as higher education, medicine, law, politics and the arts (Lajimodiere, 2013). Instead of reinforcing stereotypes, multicultural education advocates encourage teachers to talk about American Indians living in urban areas and discuss Indian achievements in the twentieth century, such as the Navajo code talkers.

Figure 5.2 Protesting Stereotypes

A group of American Indians gather at a statue to protest its stereotypical portrayal of Indians and other Indian stereotypes such as sports mascots.

Source: Kent Koppelman

Although American Indians have consistently joined the military in numbers far disproportionate to their percentage of the population over the years, and many have been awarded medals for their heroism, the Navajo code talkers made an especially critical contribution. Navajos were not the first American

Indian code talkers. During World War I, Choctaws were code talkers for Company D, 141st infantry. After the Pearl Harbor tragedy, several American Indian languages were under consideration for use in radio communications as the nation prepared for war. The challenge was to find skillful interpreters who could easily translate their native language into English. The Navajo language was selected, and Navajos developed a code in which bomber planes were called chicken hawks, an observation plane became a staring owl, and a fighter plane was referred to as a little hummingbird. The code was developed in secrecy and by 1943 was being used successfully when an article in the June issue of Arizona Highways noted that the U.S. military was using a Navajo language code, with Navajo soldiers as interpreters. Despite this revelation, the code was never broken, making it the only military code language that was never deciphered. In 1968, Navajo code talkers were recognized in an official ceremony in Chicago (Bixler, 1992). On June 4, 2014, 93-year-old veteran Chester Nez died—the last remaining member of the 29 Navajo code talkers.

Video Example 5.1

In this video, two teachers discuss the history of names, such as “redskin” in the context of the debate on sports team names. What misconceptions are there about the term redskin and its history? What role do these misconceptions play in the context of the prevalence of American Indian stereotypes today?

One fact about contemporary American Indians that seems to be widely known is that they operate casinos, but this activity has become controversial. The first Indian gaming operation was a bingo parlor that opened in Florida in 1979. Because of Indian sovereignty accorded in federal treaties, reservations primarily negotiated directly with the federal government, but in 1988, Congress passed the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, which mandated that state governments were responsible for negotiating contracts for tribes wanting to create gaming venues. This has resulted in some states approving the establishment of American Indian gaming operations and taking a share of the profits, while other states have refused to approve American Indian gaming proposals. Despite such

obstacles, Indian gaming venues have become well established in several states.

“All wars are civil wars because all men are brothers. . . . Each one owes infinitely more to the human race than to the particular country in which he was born.”

—FRANCOIS FENELON (1651–1715)

One consequence of these casinos is that some people believe that gaming revenues have solved economic problems confronting American Indians, but two-thirds of the tribes in the United States have no casinos, and of the one-third who do, only a small percent enjoy significant revenues (Cox, 2015). Yet a new stereotype has emerged based on the assumption that all American Indians share in the gaming revenues wealth and that problems of poverty and unemployment on reservations have been eliminated. Some tribes receiving significant profits from casinos have had positive outcomes when revenues are used to provide services in support of infrastructure needs, such as tribal administration, education, and healthcare, rather than simply engaging in profit sharing by distributing checks to tribal members (Hansen & Skopek, 2011).

Among tribal nations earning significant profits from gaming activities, three broad goals have emerged in addition to improving the financial status of individual tribal members. The first goal is to maintain Indian Sovereignty, the second is to lobby the regulatory body in their state to implement policies favorable to the perpetuation or increase of profits from gaming operations, and the final goal is to use their profits to reacquire ancestral lands. Those who have been successful are often regarded with what has been called “casino envy,” stemming from erroneous assumptions about the success of Indian gaming across the United States (Hansen & Skopek, 2011). Such assumptions overlook the states still refusing to approve Indian gaming proposals and ignore the enormous disparity that exists for gaming operations with minimal economic gain compared to highly publicized gaming operations that have made impressive profits.

One final issue: Beginning in the late 1970s, a study reported that when state services took American Indian children into state custody, 85 percent of them were placed in non-Indian homes or institutions. Congress passed the Indian Child Welfare Act to protect the interests of American Indian children and to promote stability in American Indian tribes and families. The law created standards that had to be met before children could be taken from

their parents and mandated that if children were taken, they should be placed in settings that reflected American Indian cultural values. Despite the law, some states persisted in separating American Indian children from their parents and placing them in non-Indian settings (Brewer, 2015).

Video Example 5.2

This video features Bryant Chapo, a skateboarder from the Navajo Nation Tribe. How does this presentation of American Indian contemporary culture challenge stereotypes about indigenous peoples? What are some of the ways that skateboarding culture responds to American Indian histories and contemporary issues facing tribal nations?

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CEoMigMxbXw&index=5&list=PL6F43EC9B22CF3317

Since then, thousands of American Indian families have been torn apart and the children placed in non-Indian foster homes, severing them from their cultural heritage. South Dakota appears to be the worst offender. Even though American Indian children are only 13 percent of all children in the state, they represent 53 percent of children in foster care. American Indian children are 11 times more likely than White children to be taken from their families. When these cases went to court, South Dakota judges defended the Department of Social Services (DSS) by claiming the likely emotional or physical harm children would sustain if returned to their parents, but they offered no proof of this claim (Brewer, 2015). After an Indian father was arrested for driving under the influence, DSS immediately removed the father’s two children from their home, even though the mother had not been involved in her husband’s arrest. She went to court to get her children back, and her hearing lasted less than two minutes, with the judge ruling that the children should be placed in foster care. The mother engaged in two months of persistent activity before her children were returned to her (Brewer, 2015). This child removal controversy remains unresolved.

Self-Check 5.1 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of the potential benefits inherent in indigenous cultures and the ongoing significance of Indian treaties and contemporary issues affecting Native Americans.

The African American Struggle for Freedom and Civil Rights

The first Africans in the New World came not as enslaved people but as soldiers and explorers. Although we do not have individual names, records

indicate that Africans came with Cortez and Pizarro in the early 1500s, that 30 Africans sailed with Balboa, and that 200 accompanied Alvarado to Quito. The names of a few Black adventurers have survived. In the early sixteenth century, Estevanico (from Morocco) explored the American Southwest, preparing the way for later Spanish conquest. In the late eighteenth century, Jean Baptist Point du Sable (from Haiti) came with French explorers and founded a permanent trading post in a settlement called Chicago (Painter, 2005).

The first Africans in the American colonies arrived in 1619. A Dutch ship traded 20 Africans to Jamestown settlers for food and water (Reiss, 1997). The 17 men and 3 women were not enslaved people but indentured servants, able to gain their freedom after specified years of servitude. During the seventeenth century, 75 percent of American colonists came as servants, many of them indentured servants (Takaki, 1993).

How were the Black indentured servants treated differently?

A few Africans were able to earn their freedom, and some had to resort to courts to free them from unwilling owners, but most were never free. A few free Black people bought property, even including enslaved people, but by the mid-1800s, the colonies were establishing different rules for White and Black servants. Africans were often forced to accept permanent servitude status. A 1662 Virginia statute decreed that children born to a woman who was a permanent indentured servant must take her status (Reiss, 1997). 70 percent of Africans in Virginia at this time were permanent indentured servants (Takaki, 1993).

As southern agriculture gravitated toward large plantations for the export of crops, the use of slaves became increasingly attractive. American Indian workers knew the region and easily escaped, and White indentured servants escaped and passed as free White people. Black people could be easily identified, captured, and returned to their owners. Because England was already invested in the slave trade, exporting Africans to America was an expansion of an existing business. From the late 1500s to the early 1800s, more than 10 million Africans were brought to America, but many of them died on the trip from Africa during what is called the Middle Passage.

Why did so many Africans die during the middle passage?

Conditions on slave ships were horrendous. According to Reiss (1997), a full-grown man was allotted a space 6 feet long and 18 inches wide in the hold. Women and children were given even less. There was no room to sit up.

Slaves were chained together and packed into the hold in a “spoon” position to maintain maximum space. Reiss quoted Lord Palmerston, “They had less room than a corpse in a coffin” (p. 34).

“Until lions have their historians, tales of the hunt will always glorify the hunter.”

—AFRICAN PROVERB

En route, the enslaved people were fed twice a day and given buckets to relieve themselves; the buckets were seldom emptied and frequently overflowed. Many were unable to get to the buckets and soiled themselves where they lay. Not surprisingly, disease was a major cause of death, including typhoid, smallpox, yellow fever, and malaria (Painter, 2005).

Because bodies of the dead were tossed overboard, sharks routinely accompanied slave ships. As enslaved people were brought up on deck during the day, some took the opportunity to escape by leaping into the shark-infested waters. Scholars estimate that from five to six million Africans died during Middle Passage, and some who survived were left with permanent disabilities (Reiss, 1997). As bad as conditions were on slave ships, slavery was even more brutal. A day of work could be as long as 18 hours during harvest, with brief rest periods to eat. Overseers punished those who didn’t appear to be working hard enough, usually by whipping. Women worked with men and often endured sexual assault from masters and overseers.

How did Africans resist the oppression of slavery?

African captives engaged in a range of activities in their resistance to slavery. Some cut off their toes or mutilated themselves in other ways so they would be less useful workers for their enslavers. In addition, some enslaved people murdered their enslavers; many enslavers lived in fear of being poisoned by their enslaved servants (Franklin & Moss, 2000). Some enslaved people learned to read and write either by tricking their enslavers into teaching them or by converting to Christianity and persuading their enslaver to give them the literacy skills needed to read the Bible (Cornelius, 2000). They perceived competent literacy skills to be a useful tool to assist themselves and other enslaved people, as well as an important asset if they managed to escape from slavery.

When enslaved people converted to Christianity, their enslavers tried to use aspects of the faith to manipulate them into being more docile and obedient.

For example, although enslavers exhorted enslaved people to obey the commandment against stealing, enslaved people continued to steal. They justified their thefts by regarding their owners as hypocrites: The enslavers were responsible for stealing Africans from their homeland and their families. The captive Africans also rejected “moral” precepts emphasized by some White ministers. Raboteau (2000) described a service for enslaved converts in which a White clergyman used a passage from the Apostle Paul in a sermon condemning slaves who ran away. During the sermon, the clergyman reported that “one half of my audience deliberately rose up and walked off” (p. 31).

Why did Black people fight on the American side during the Revolutionary War?

When the war began, George Washington and his aides agreed that the Continental Army would not recruit Black people. Alexander Hamilton warned that if they did not, the British would (Chernow, 2004). In November 1775, Washington issued his policy against recruiting Black people, and British supporters quickly recruited enslaved people by promising emancipation for military service. Washington issued a new policy in December, permitting free Black men to serve in the Continental Army. Meanwhile, colonial militias were already recruiting enslaved people as well as free Black men. According to Franklin and Moss (2000), 5000 of the 300,000 colonial troops were Africans, primarily free Black men from northern colonies. The bravery of Black soldiers refuted the pervasive stereotypes, but their achievements were betrayed when the U.S. Constitution was drafted.

How did the U.S. constitution address the issue of slavery?

Although enslaved people represented 20 percent of all Americans at this time, the word slave does not appear in the Constitution of the United States (Painter, 2005); instead, it refers to “unfree persons.” Article II, section 9, states that “importation of such persons as any of the States now-existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by Congress prior to the year 1808.” In deference to southern plantation owners and businesses, the new nation had agreed to ignore the slave trade for 20 years; however, taxes were to be collected on imported enslaved people. Even northern states that had abolished slavery profited from the continued importation of enslaved people.

Another issue in drafting the Constitution concerned the question of whether enslaved people should count in determining political representation. With

300,000 enslaved people representing 40 percent of its population, Virginia wanted them to be counted, as did North and South Carolina, with over 100,000 enslaved people in each state (Painter, 2005). The constitutional compromise was to count each enslaved person as three fifths of a person, giving significant political power to southern states: Ten of the first 15 American presidents were slaveholders. Nevertheless, anti-slavery organizations became increasingly influential.

Who opposed slavery, and what did they do?

In 1775, Quakers organized the first anti-slavery society in Philadelphia; 10 years later another was formed in New York. Anti-slavery societies soon formed throughout New England (Chernow, 2004). In 1777, Vermont abolished slavery in its state constitution, and in 1783, New Hampshire and Massachusetts did the same. In two decades, all northern states had abolished slavery or legislated a timeline for its extinction. Some organizations lobbied to end the slave trade, and others wanted to deport enslaved people, but all agreed on the principle of abolishing slavery. When the 20-year constitutional hiatus ended in 1808, anti-slavery groups successfully lobbied Congress to pass a law that prohibited importation of enslaved people to the United States. The law was primarily a moral victory because the American coast was too long and the U.S. Navy too small to stop the smuggling of enslaved people.

Africans, enslaved or free, adamantly opposed slavery. Thousands of enslaved people ran away, and many successfully escaped. Former slaves Harriet Jacobs and Frederick Douglass gave speeches and wrote books denouncing slavery. In addition, between 1750 and 1860, there were an estimated 250 rebellions by enslaved people, each involving 10 or more enslaved people (Zinn, 2003), as well as numerous smaller rebellions. In February 1831, a solar eclipse inspired perhaps the best-known rebellion. Nat Turner interpreted the eclipse as an omen, and six months later he led a rebellion that began with the killing of Turner’s enslaver and family, and went on to result in the deaths of 60 other enslavers before the enslaved people were overpowered by federal troops (Franklin & Moss, 2005).

As early as the 1770s, free Black people petitioned colonial legislatures to emancipate enslaved people. Using the words of revolutionary leaders, they challenged White people to live up to their ideals of democracy and equality by making them a reality for all (Painter, 2005). The original draft of the Declaration of Independence denounced slavery as an “execrable” practice, but the Continental Congress deleted that particular passage at the

insistence of southern enslavers. Many enslaved people began using the Underground Railroad to escape from slavery.

What was the Underground Railroad?

Named in the 1800s because of the popularity of steam railroads, the Underground Railroad existed as early as the late 1700s as a network of people helping enslaved people escape. Franklin and Moss (2000) quote a 1786 letter from George Washington complaining that one of his slaves escaped and went to Philadelphia, where “a society of Quakers, formed for such purposes, have attempted to liberate (him)” (p. 205). By 1804, this informal network had become more organized and had established “stations” 10 to 20 miles apart for runaways to rest and eat after traveling all night. The organization eventually included over 3000 people of all races (Painter, 2005). They had to be careful because helping enslaved people escape was a criminal activity, violating federal fugitive slave laws that compelled the return of any runaway enslaved people.

Some enslaved people had a “conductor” to help them escape; one of the best known was Harriet Tubman, who made 19 trips and freed over 300 enslaved people. Plantation owners offered $40,000 to anyone who caught her, but they never did (Painter, 2005). Although it is impossible to determine how many enslaved people escaped using the Underground Railroad, one southern governor estimated that from 1810 to 1850 the South had lost 100,000 enslaved people worth $30 million (Franklin & Moss, 2000). Still, all enslaved Africans in America would not gain their freedom until the end of the Civil War.

Did slaves and free Black people fight for the Union during the Civil War?

Enslaved people supported the North during the Civil War by disrupting southern productivity. Many refused to work even though they were severely punished; others engaged in subversive tactics such as supplying information to approaching Union troops. When Union soldiers came near a plantation, enslaved people would abandon it. Early Union victories in western states liberated enslaved people, but the federal government had not allocated resources to assist them. In northern cities, relief societies formed to raise money for food, clothing, and shelter and provided some education and job training for newly freed Black people.

When the war began, free Black men offered to enlist, but once again they were rejected. Few people believed the conflict would last long, but when it did, the need for more soldiers intensified. In September 1862, the

Emancipation Proclamation freed Black people in rebellious states, but enslavers in Delaware and Kentucky kept slaves until the 13th Amendment was ratified. Issued in January 1863, the final version of the Emancipation Proclamation allowed free Black men to enlist in the army. Over 200,000 Black men enlisted. By August, 14 Black regiments were trained and ready for service, with 20 more regiments in preparation (Franklin & Moss, 2000).

Black soldiers protested the Congressional Enlistment Act that established lower compensation for them. Two Black regiments from Massachusetts refused their wages rather than receive less pay than White soldiers. When the Massachusetts legislature offered them money to make up for the difference, the Black soldiers refused that offer. They were fighting for the Union, and they insisted that the Union pay them fairly. In 1865, the War Department finally approved equal pay for Black and White soldiers (Painter, 2005), even though it came too late for the 38,000 Black soldiers who had died. For those who survived the war, the next task was to create a new society in the South that would include a significant number of free Black people.

Did Black people play a role in shaping the new South?

Black men (but not women) could vote and run for office, and 16 were elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. There was one Black governor (Louisiana) and six Black lieutenant governors, and over 600 Black people were elected to state legislatures and participated in drafting new state constitutions (Goldstone, 2011). In response, some groups of southern White people formed secret societies such as the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan to bribe or intimidate Black people and ostracize those White people who seemed to support the developing new social order. Many racist groups began to use violence to reestablish White supremacy in the South, usually engaging in activities at night.

Black people who registered to vote were harassed; some were forced to leave their communities, and some were lynched. In 1871, Black men elected to the South Carolina legislature were given 15 days to resign. State laws prohibited such harassment, but even Union troops stationed throughout the South were ineffective at stopping it. The U.S. Congress passed laws giving the president broad powers to punish anyone interfering with a citizen trying to vote. Hundreds were imprisoned, but violence persisted.

Throughout the 1870s, the Democratic Party, led by White southerners, elected majorities to state legislatures. Congress no longer required federal troops at all southern polling places during elections. By 1877, when President Harrison withdrew federal troops, efforts to re-establish White power accelerated. During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the U.S. Supreme Court enacted rulings sanctioning southern legislation that prevented Black people from voting, removed them from jury rolls, maintained their segregated schools, and required racial segregation in public transportation and public facilities (Goldstone, 2011). With these Supreme Court decisions, the transformation to the "Jim Crow" South with complete racial segregation was concluded.

"The basic race hatred in the United States is a matter of the educated and distinguished leaders of white civilization."

—W. E. B. DU BOIS (1868–1963)

How did Black citizens in the South respond to this transformation?

Southern Black people did not accept the threats and harassment passively, yet without support from the federal government or northern organizations, they did not have the resources to combat White supremacists. They regarded education as the best way to acquire resources and power on their own, but with minimal state funding for schools, educational opportunities were limited. As late as the 1890s, southern states supported segregated private schools, spending an average of less than $2 annually per student in public schools compared to the $20 per student provided in northern states (Lewis, 1993).

In 1881, Booker T. Washington came to Tuskegee Institute and created an educational approach that appealed to White people and many Black people. Washington wanted Black people to carve out a niche in the southern economy, and he knew that White people could accept Black people doing agricultural, domestic, and factory work. Washington cultivated good relations with local leaders by having his students provide food and services to the community, and he promoted his school as a model for Black education in the South. Eventually Washington attracted interest and funding from northern White people, many of whom were industrialists who wanted a better trained workforce in the South.

At the Atlanta Cotton Exposition of 1895, Washington declared that he believed Black people would be willing to accept social inequality in exchange for economic opportunity. White politicians, business leaders, and

the press claimed that Washington spoke for Black Americans, but some Black people, notably W. E. B. Du Bois, believed Black Americans deserved more.

What did Du Bois want for Black Americans?

Based on his own experience as the first Black graduate from Harvard, Du Bois felt that Black people could demonstrate academic ability if given an opportunity. Du Bois rejected the idea that social inequality for Black people was acceptable under any conditions. He supported vocational training for Black students, but not for those who demonstrated academic ability. Du Bois's approach was overt and confrontational. Although Washington worked within the status quo, secretly donating money in support of legal efforts opposing racial segregation, Du Bois challenged the status quo, publicly denouncing all racial discrimination, as in the following statement (Lewis, 1993):

Such discrimination is morally wrong, politically dangerous, and industrially wasteful and socially silly. It is the duty of whites to stop it, and to do so primarily for their own sakes. (p. 208)

In 1910, Du Bois helped found the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and for 25 years he served as editor of its main publication, The Crisis. For 18 years he hosted a conference on race problems at Atlanta University, and he helped found the American Negro Academy for Black intellectuals. Throughout his life, Du Bois attacked racism and promoted racial equality in his research, reports, essays, and even fiction (Lewis, 2000).

What were Black Americans doing to cope with race problems?

In the late 1800s, southern Black people began to migrate to northern cities, driven by economic need and persistent violence in the South, especially lynching. (See Figure 5.3.) For more than thirty years, Ida Wells-Barnett took a public stand against lynching, ignoring many death threats. In 1914, The Crisis published the names of 2732 Black people lynched between 1885 and 1914, and the NAACP challenged Congress to pass anti-lynching laws (Lewis, 1993). According to Feagin and Feagin (2008), at least half of all lynchings were not recorded, so the total number is estimated to be over 6000. The House of Representatives passed anti-lynching bills in 1922, 1937, and 1940,

but southern senators blocked them. It was not until June 2005 that the Senate finally voted to issue a public apology for its failure to pass an anti-lynching law.

Figure 5.3 “THE REASON”

Cartoonist Albert Smith illustrated “The Reason” for Black people to migrate north in the 1920s.

Source: Albert Smith

Southern migration to the north was not dramatic until the twentieth century. According to Feagin and Feagin (2008), 90 percent of all Black Americans still lived in the South in 1900. Migration increased significantly between 1914 and 1918, when World War I created labor shortages because few Europeans immigrated. By the end of the war, a million Black people had moved to northern cities. Over 360,000 out of more than two million registered Black people served in World War I, and many returning southern Black soldiers settled in northern cities (Franklin & Moss, 2000). In 1900, Chicago had 30,000 Black people by 1920, it had over 109,000. By 1930, two million southern Black people had migrated to northern cities (Takaki, 1993). Even with this larger urban population, discrimination persisted. W. E. B. DuBois and other African American leaders joined with White allies such as Charles Edward Russell and Mary White Ovington to found the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), an organization committed to confronting White supremacist attitudes and actions.

As Americans welcomed war heroes from World War I, buried the dead, and cared for maimed and suffering veterans, they were ready for a new era. As F. Scott Fitzgerald said, “The uncertainties of 1919 were over—there seemed little doubt about what was going to happen—America was going on the greatest, gaudiest spree in history” (2005, p. 188). Prohibition drove drinking into the shadows of speakeasies. Jack Dempsey drew the first million-dollar gate in boxing. Babe Ruth became the highest paid baseball player in history. And in New York City, Black people began a cultural and literary development called the Harlem Renaissance.

What was the Harlem Renaissance?

People came to Harlem in the 1920s to enjoy the clubs, dancing, and jazz, creating an open community where people from all races would dance to Duke Ellington at the Cotton Club or listen to Louis Armstrong at the Savoy. As Americans enjoyed a variety of new music, new dances, new artists, and

new writers, Harlem contributed the novels of Jean Toomer, the poetry of Langston Hughes, and the creative works of many others who expressed the uniqueness of the Black experience in America. Although it was a racially segregated community, Harlem was home to diverse Black peoples, including newly arrived southern Black people, Africans, and West Indians. Spivey (2003) notes that this mix of people produced a new kind of Black individual, quoting Alain Locke's description of how this "New Negro" emerged: "Each group has come with its own separate motives and its own special ends . . . but their greatest experience has been the finding of one another" (p. 165).

Was there a decrease in discrimination against Black people after World War I?

Many African Americans were upset that the U.S. military did not recognize the achievements of Black soldiers during World War I. For more than six months, the Black first battalion of the 369th infantry endured continuous fire while fighting in France. The French awarded the Croix de Guerre to the battalion, but the U.S. Army did not invite the first battalion (or any Black units) to Paris for the victory parade in August 1918 (Lewis, 1993). Many Black mothers received Gold Stars symbolizing the loss of a son, but when the French government invited American Gold Star mothers to France to honor them, the Army only paid for the White mothers. Black mothers who attended had to pay their own way (Painter, 2005).

"Had it not been for our art and our culture, when all else was ripped from us, we would never have been able to survive as a people."

—HARRY BELAFONTE (1927–)

The 1920s saw the rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan, reaching a peak of five million members in 1925. In 1921, a White mob in Tulsa, Oklahoma, set fire to all of the buildings in the Black community and burned them to the ground. In 1923, White people also destroyed the Black community of Rosewood, Florida. The NAACP experienced dramatic growth at this time, expanding from 50 chapters to more than 500 between the two world wars (Woodward, 1966). Attitudes were slowly changing about race, thanks to the work of scholars such as Franz Boas, who questioned the soundness of "scientific" studies of race. He noted that intelligence scores, supposedly not malleable, changed when an individual's environment changed significantly. Boas emphasized culture instead of race and asserted that culture was dynamic rather than unchanging (Painter, 2010).

As the Great Depression began, many Black farmers were ejected from their land. As for Black workers in northern cities, over 26 unions did not accept Black members in 1930, and Black unemployment was three to four times higher than that of White unemployment (Feagin & Feagin, 2008). In October 1933, 18 percent of Black people were receiving government assistance ("relief") compared to 10 percent for White people, and relief programs often provided Black families less than the amount given to White families (Takaki, 1993). The best hope for Black people seemed to be the nominee of the Democratic Party, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his "New Deal."

Did the New Deal programs help Black Americans?

Millions of Black people benefited from New Deal programs, yet millions of others did not. The Social Security Act provided financial security for older Americans, and the Fair Labor Standards Act established a minimum wage, but both excluded agricultural and domestic work—jobs largely held by Black people (Lui, 2004). Black union leader A. Philip Randolph threatened to organize a march on Washington until President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 banning racial discrimination in defense industries and creating a Federal Employment Practice Commission, but he was criticized for appointing a White Mississippian to head the commission (Lewis, 2000).

Despite the president's mixed record, Black people appreciated the social activism of Eleanor Roosevelt and her close relationship with Black activist Mary McLeod Bethune. In 1936, while heading the Division of Negro Affairs, Bethune helped create the Federal Council on Negro Affairs, an advisory group to the president consisting of 30 Black professionals. Media soon referred to them as FDR's Black Cabinet. FDR appointed Black people to serve in the Federal Housing Authority, Department of the Interior, and other federal agencies; during this time Black Americans increasingly changed their allegiance to the Democratic Party, but their participation in the nation's economic recovery was not meaningful until World War II began.

What gains did Black Americans make during World War II?

With so many men enlisting in the military, more than a million were Black, jobs were available for Black men and women, especially in defense industries. Black people in the military were selected for programs that had not been permitted before, such as the engineer corps, pilot training, and officer training. For the first time in its history, the Marine Corps recruited African Americans. When the Navy restricted Black men to mess hall duties, they protested, and within a year they were given general assignments and

included in officer training programs (Franklin & Moss, 2000). In 1948, President Truman issued Executive Order 9981, officially desegregating the U.S. Armed Forces.

What happened to African Americans after the war?

Many Americans regarded the defeat of Germany as a victory over Nazi beliefs of racial superiority. By the war's end, half of the major unions had accepted Black members (Feagin & Feagin, 2008), and Black veterans symbolized to all Black people that they earned the right to have the same rights and opportunities as other Americans. In business and industry, however, the percentage of Black men and women laid off during the postwar period was considerably higher than that for White people, suggesting a return to "business as usual" attitudes. Racial discrimination in the implementation of the GI Bill was especially frustrating for African Americans.

For World War II veterans who wanted to attend college, the GI Bill covered all of their tuition, fees, and even subsistence payments. As early as 1947, 49 percent of all students attending college were veterans, and over twice that number used the GI Bill to attend vocational or business schools, or participate in apprenticeships and other on-the-job training (Schuck, 2014). However, most colleges and universities were racially segregated and refused to admit veterans of color; historically Black colleges were small institutions with too few openings to accommodate the demand from returning veterans of color. The GI Bill resulted in more money being spent on education than was used in the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe (Hamilton, Cottom, Darity, Aja, & Ash, 2015). By 1956, when the GI Bill ended, almost half of the 16 million veterans who returned home after the war had enrolled in college or in a job-training program (Friedman & Mandelbaum, 2011).

Despite overt racial discrimination, the NAACP and its allies were successful in court case rulings against racial desegregation in transportation and education, and in 1954, Brown v. Board of Education overturned decades of legal discrimination based on race. It was a victory more in principle than in practice as segregation in America persisted; nevertheless, in the context of such moral victories, the civil rights movement was born, opposing discrimination but also challenging Americans to recognize their prejudices and stereotypes.

With more Black people demanding their rights as American citizens, the response from southerners became more violent. In August 1955, a 14-year-

old Black youth from Chicago came to Mississippi to visit relatives. After Emmett Till showed a group of Black friends a picture of a White girl he knew in Chicago, one of the boys dared him to go into the nearby store and talk to the White woman working there. After buying candy in the store, Emmett turned before leaving and said, “Bye, Baby.” The woman’s husband was out of town but soon returned. It was shortly after midnight when he and two friends came to the home of Mose Wright, where Till was staying, and dragged the boy out of bed. They brutally murdered him and threw his body in the Tallahatchie River. When his corpse was found three days later, it was so badly mutilated that Mose Wright could only identify the boy by a ring on Emmett’s finger (Williams, 1987).

Emmett’s mother demanded an open casket at his funeral so that mourners could see what had been done to her son. Photographs of the boy’s mangled face appeared in newspapers across the nation, shocking most Americans. The three men responsible were arrested and brought to trial. Despite the courageous testimony of Mose Wright, who identified the accused men as the ones who took Emmett Till from his house, the all-White jury acquitted all three men of kidnapping and murder. People of all races expressed outrage at the injustice (Williams, 1987).

What did the civil rights movement achieve for African Americans?

In Montgomery, Alabama, Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King Jr. inspired African Americans to conduct a boycott of city bus services to end racial segregation. The boycott lasted over a year; then in 1957, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a federal court ruling to desegregate public bus transportation systems. In February 1960, four Black college freshmen in Greensboro, North Carolina, entered a Woolworth store and deliberately sat at a lunch counter that served only White people. When refused service, the Black students opened their textbooks and read. They eventually left, but they returned, and other students came with them. The idea spread across the nation as 70,000 students, mostly Black but some White, staged more than 800 sit-ins in over 100 southern cities. As more than 4000 students were arrested, White people stayed away from lunch counters, and many would not shop in stores where sit-ins were occurring. The economic losses forced many businesses to begin offering services to Black people (Lomax, 1963).

Although Martin Luther King Jr. encouraged nonviolent tactics, younger, radical Black leaders encouraged Black Americans to return violence for violence. The passionate oratory of Malcolm X may have predisposed some White people to begin listening to the peaceful rhetoric of King and his

followers. Even after Malcolm X ended his association with the extremist Nation of Islam to pursue a more authentic Islamic faith, he insisted that Black people should demand the same rights as White Americans—not just civil rights but their human rights (Malcolm X, 2000).

“Non-cooperation with evil is as much a duty as is cooperation with good.”

—MOHANDIS K. GANDHI (1869–1948)

Another militant voice came from the Black Panther Party founded in 1966 by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale. The Black Panthers attracted Black youth, especially in urban areas. Despite the Panthers’ sponsoring community service activities such as a free breakfast program for Black children, White authorities saw them as a paramilitary organization. FBI Counterintelligence kept its leaders under surveillance, and Panther offices were subjected to police raids. Newton’s 1967 arrest and imprisonment on murder charges weakened the Panthers, as did the violent assaults on party members that left 28 dead (Sanchez & Hagopian, 2017). By the mid-1970s, most Panther leaders either had been expelled from or had voluntarily left the organization.

Throughout the 1960s, the South was the primary scene for marches, protests, and demonstrations. In 1963 alone, the Department of Justice recorded over 1400 events in three months (Zinn, 2003). As usual, the White response was immediate and violent, but this time some of the violence was recorded by the national press and witnessed by a national audience. The images of law enforcement officers using dogs, fire hoses, and clubs to assault unarmed Black people left many White viewers appalled, and yet even more violence took place. Mississippi civil rights leader Medgar Evers was shot and killed on his front porch. A bomb placed in the basement of a Birmingham church killed four Black children, and in 1968, Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated in Memphis.

Being White did not protect protestors. When Freedom Riders rode integrated buses to test southern compliance with desegregation laws, mobs attacked the buses, assaulting White and Black people as local law enforcement and the FBI observed the violence but did nothing (Zinn, 2003). In Mississippi, authorities found the bodies of three young civil rights workers who had been murdered. During a Selma-to-Montgomery march in Alabama, a White minister was beaten to death, and a White housewife transporting marchers to Selma was shot and killed (Painter, 2005).

Amid this turmoil, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, forbidding discrimination in public accommodations, federally assisted programs, public facilities, and education, followed by the Voting Rights Act (VRA) of 1965. By outlawing voter suppression tactics such as literacy tests and by sending federal observers to southern states to assist in the law's enforcement, the VRA was extraordinarily successful in expanding the opportunity for African Americans and other racial minorities to register and vote in local, state, and national elections. In 1952, 20 percent of eligible southern Black people were registered to vote; because of this legislation, 40 percent of eligible southern Black voters were registered in 1964, and by 1968, 60 percent of Black people were registered, the same percentage as for White people (Zinn, 2003).

Video Example 5.3

In this video, a teacher discusses how students define diversity. Pay attention to how the students respond. How might the students' desires for "more things for Black kids to get excited about" reflect the effects of historical oppression in schools?

In less than a decade, rates of voter registration and voting were almost the same for Black and White voters in the targeted states, and since the passage of the VRA there has been a significant increase in Black people and other minorities being elected to public office. The number of Black elected officials increased from 500 in 1965 to 10,500 in 2011 (Schuck, 2014). Because of its success, many VRA supporters were critical of the 2013 Shelby County decision where the U.S. Supreme Court declared Section 4 of the VRA unconstitutional; it required designated states to secure federal preclearance before making any changes to voting laws or practices. The Court said this section of the law was an anachronism that no longer made sense, but critics point out that the designated states (as others) are still engaged in voter suppression tactics (Schuck, 2014).

Self-Check 5.2 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of Black and White resistance to slavery in the United States and the struggle of Black people after the Civil War to attain their civil rights as American citizens.

Historic Hostility Against Asian Immigrants and Contemporary Stereotypes

The first Asian immigrants to the United States were from four villages in the Canton province of China. Arriving in 1850, they set the Chinese pattern of predominantly male migration to America with a ratio of 10 men for every 1

woman (Lowe, 2000). Chinese immigrants were lured to California by the thought of finding gold and returning to China. San Francisco welcomed the new arrivals by inviting them to participate in California's statehood ceremonies, but by 1870, 63,000 Chinese immigrants had arrived, with more than 75 percent in California, representing 25 percent of the state's workforce (Fong, 2000). Nativists accused these "aliens" of bringing "moral chaos" to California because they were from a non-European culture, which meant they brought "foreign" cultural beliefs and practices that did not correspond with our national identity as Americans (Lee, Kumashiro, & Sleeter, 2015).

What actions did nativists initially take against the Chinese in America?

Nativists lobbied the California legislature for a tax on non-U.S. citizens who were mining for gold (Takaki, 1993). Although the tax penalized any immigrant, the passage of the "foreign miners" act was a major setback for the Chinese. Most had borrowed money and were expected to repay their debts on arriving in America. In addition to paying for their passage, they were expected to send money home to support their wives and families, and two thirds of them managed to earn enough money to take care of their financial obligations and return to China (Glenn & Yap, 2000). Because of the 1790 law restricting U.S. citizenship to "Whites only," there was little incentive to remain in the United States.

Who employed Chinese immigrants?

Unable to mine for gold, many Chinese men found work as laborers on the western portion of the transcontinental railroad. Railroad owners paid the Chinese less than other workers and forced them to work during the winter of 1866, despite snowdrifts as high as 60 feet. They had to tunnel under the snow, digging shafts to allow for air so they could work. After that winter, Chinese workers went on strike for higher wages, only to be denounced by local newspapers and literally starved into submission when railroad owners cut off food supplies (Takaki, 1993). When the railroad was completed, most Chinese laborers returned to China, but some chose to stay, particularly in the area of San Francisco.

Wherever they settled, Chinese men continued to be paid low wages. In addition to agricultural jobs, they worked in factories or were employed as houseboys, gardeners, and cooks, and a few started small businesses. Starting a laundry was especially tempting because it required a small investment for equipment and minimal English skills. Being self-employed

enabled them to avoid both exploitation by employers and competition with hostile White laborers.

What kind of hostile actions did the Chinese encounter?

The White population in general tended to perceive the Chinese as refusing to give up their “foreign” identity and become “Americanized.” Some White men would occasionally target Chinese men who maintained traditions such as the “queue,” a long single braid of hair worn down their back. (See Figure 5.4.) Chinese laborers complained of White men grabbing or even cutting off their queue. It wasn’t long before such hostility escalated to violent confrontation.

Figure 5.4 Anti-Chinese Attitudes

Newspapers often expressed their hostility to Chinese immigrants in cartoons.

Source: The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

Figure 5.4 Full Alternative Text

The U.S. economy experienced a depression in the 1870s, yet the numbers of Chinese increased, and many were becoming visibly prosperous. Looking for a scapegoat, politicians and labor leaders blamed economic problems on the Chinese, and newspapers published and disseminated their views. In 1871, mob violence resulted in the deaths of 21 Chinese men in Los Angeles; in 1885, 28 Chinese railroad workers were killed in Rock Springs, Wyoming (Fong, 2000; Wu, 1972). Although Chinese immigrants constituted less than 1 percent of the U.S. population in 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act to prohibit Chinese immigration for the next 10 years; it was renewed for another 10 years in 1892, and renewed indefinitely in 1902. The door to the “Gold Mountain” closed.

During another economic recession in the 1890s, unemployed White workers rioted, beating and shooting Chinese workers. Such violence often discouraged the Chinese from continuing to work as laborers, except for employers who were also Chinese. The Chinese created their own communities in urban areas—Chinatowns—where they felt safe establishing businesses and homes, and less vulnerable to discrimination and violence. Chinese entrepreneurs often pooled their resources to start a business, and they would employ other Chinese. By 1890, the 6400 Chinese workers employed in California laundries constituted 69 percent of all laundry employees in the state (Takaki, 1993).

Although they were willing to live in separate communities, most Chinese who remained in America were unwilling to be perceived as foreigners in the land. By 1924, Andrew Kan had lived and worked in the United States for over 40 years, and he took his case to court to insist on his right to be an American citizen; the courts disagreed. In fact, anti-Asian sentiment would intensify during World War II as the United States fought a Japanese enemy portrayed as treacherous and brutal.

How did Americans view the Japanese before World War II?

By 1880, only 148 Japanese lived in the United States (Fong, 2000); however, 150,000 Japanese immigrated to the mainland between 1880 and 1908. By the 1920s, the Japanese population in America was twice as large as that of the Chinese (Zia, 2000). By 1920, women constituted 46 percent of the Japanese in Hawaii and 35 percent in California (Takaki, 1993). Based on their awareness of the hostility toward the male Chinese immigrants, Japanese government officials screened immigration applications to ensure that those approved included married couples.

In 1905, California newspapers initiated a campaign against the Yellow Peril based on the belief that the Japanese, like the Chinese, could not or would not adopt the American culture (Feagin & Feagin, 2008). In reality, many Japanese immigrants had assimilated and desired to become American citizens. In 1922, Takao Ozawa challenged the 1790 law restricting U.S. citizenship to White people. Ozawa had been educated in American schools, belonged to a Christian church, and spoke only English at home. Ozawa's argument to the U.S. Supreme Court was that he had done everything that any immigrant could be asked to do to assimilate into the culture, and the only thing that prevented his citizenship was his race. The Supreme Court said that was all that mattered and rejected his appeal.

Before the Supreme Court made its decision, California legislators in both houses passed a resolution calling for the prohibition of further Japanese immigration. Responding to such nativist sentiment, President Theodore Roosevelt met with Japanese officials in 1908 and reached the Gentleman's Agreement that Japan would prohibit further immigration except for the close relatives of those already in the United States. Japanese immigrants could use this loophole until 1920 to bring family members—including "picture brides"—to join them in America.

"If we believe absurdities we shall commit atrocities."

—VOLTAIRE (1694–1778)

What was a picture bride?

Japanese culture regarded marriage as an affair negotiated between families. In the picture bride system, matchmaking resulted from an exchange of photographs. Combining those who came with their husbands and those who came as picture brides, 60,000 Japanese women immigrated to America (including Hawaii) and gave birth to almost 30,000 children. These children, Nisei, were Americans by right of birth. Most Japanese immigrants still lived in Hawaii, constituting 40 percent of the population; they were less than 2 percent of California residents (Zia, 2000).

Where were Japanese immigrants employed?

The Japanese often worked in canneries and took a variety of jobs, but many worked as agricultural laborers, as they had done in Japan. Some began to contract for land, negotiating a share of the profits with the owner or guaranteeing a set price after the crop was sold. The owner provided seed and equipment, so with minimal investment and intense labor, Japanese farmers were able to be quite successful. Some saved enough money to secure a loan and lease or purchase land, giving them the opportunity for higher profits. By 1910, Japanese farmers in California owned or leased about 200,000 acres of land, producing almost all of the state's celery and snap beans, three quarters of the strawberries, and almost half of the onions and green peas (Takaki, 1993).

In 1913, California legislators passed the Alien Land Law to prohibit any immigrant ineligible for citizenship from owning land or leasing land for more than three years. Because their children, the Nisei, were American citizens, the Japanese leased or purchased land in their children's names; those who had no children paid other families for the right to use their children's names as their "landlords" (Zia, 2000). This prompted the California legislature to pass a new Alien Land Law in 1920, prohibiting the use of children's names to lease or purchase land.

Japanese immigrants were disappointed that their success, efforts to assimilate, and children's citizenship status did not reduce hostility against them. Even when they possessed a college diploma, Nisei children were not likely to find work. Many returned to the family business, and those who were doctors or dentists tended to work in the Japanese communities (Takaki, 1993). Then World War II began, and Japan became America's enemy.

How did the war affect American attitudes toward Japanese families living in the United States?

Rumors of spying and sabotage began to circulate. Japanese farmers were accused of planting flowers in a particular pattern to guide airplanes carrying bombs to their target (Feagin & Feagin, 2008). Fearing a broad anti-Asian backlash, many Asian-owned businesses posted signs saying that the owners were Asian but not Japanese. Some shops sold buttons that said, “I am Korean” or “I am Chinese” so Americans would not confuse them with Japanese (Koppelman, 2001).

What actions were taken against the Japanese during World War II?

Barely two months into the war, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 9066 that was the basis for taking Japanese Americans from their communities and relocating them in federal “camps.” Japanese families were given a week or less to sell property and possessions, packing what remained into their suitcases. More than 100,000 people, two thirds of them American citizens, lost almost everything as they were evacuated to 10 federal camps. The path to these relocation camps was paved with widespread prejudices that were affirmed by political leaders at all levels of state and national government. (See Figure 5.5.)

Figure 5.5 Defining “The Enemy”

The Japanese American relocation camps of World War II illustrate the perception of these American citizens as “foreign.” Rumors that there were spies from Japan circulating among them were enough to justify confiscating their property and keeping them behind barbed wire for the duration of the war.

Source: Seattle Museum of History and Industry.

Once at the camps, Japanese families were informed that the U.S. government required them to take a loyalty oath renouncing their allegiance to Japan. The Nisei were already American citizens, so this was not an issue for them, but for their parents, renouncing Japanese citizenship with no chance of becoming American citizens meant that they would become people without a country. When 4600 of them refused to sign the oath, they were sent to federal prisons (Zia, 2000). Despite such treatment, 23,000 Japanese men joined the army to prove their loyalty. The army segregated its troops by race, and a Japanese American regiment, the 442nd, became the most highly decorated unit of the war. Yet until the war’s end, Japanese families continued to be kept in camps with barbed wire and armed soldiers.

It is a tribute to the tenacity of Japanese Americans that so many were able to rebuild their lives and their finances after the war.

What other Asian immigrants faced anti-Asian attitudes?

Between 1907 and 1910, large numbers of Filipinos immigrated primarily to Hawaii as agricultural laborers. When the 1924 immigration law prohibited Asian people from entering the United States, Filipinos immigrated not as Asians, but as “nationals” because the Philippines had become American territory after the Spanish-American War. Of the 45,000 who had entered the United States by 1930, most were young men who worked as agricultural workers or domestic servants. Filipinos tended to be active in labor unions, causing resentment among both White landowners and other laborers (Fong, 2000).

In 1934, Congress passed legislation restricting Filipino immigration to 50 people annually. Filipinos were prohibited from entering many professions and were declared ineligible for federal aid during the Great Depression. Yet during World War II, the army recruited 30,000 Filipinos to fight the Japanese in the Philippines. Although Filipino soldiers were promised full citizenship, the promise was not kept until 1990, long after many had died (Feagin & Feagin, 2008).

Koreans first began immigrating to the United States in the early 1900s to work in agriculture or as domestic servants. Like other Asian immigrants, they encountered oppression. They were refused entrance into some restaurants, not allowed access to some public places, and restricted to racially segregated neighborhoods. Because Japan had conquered Korea in the late 1930s, Koreans hoped that the allies would defeat their historic enemy during World War II; instead, the U.S. government classified Koreans as “Japanese” during the war because Japan governed Korea (Feagin & Feagin, 2008).

After the war, the total ban on Asian immigration was slightly modified, but the number of Korean immigrants was minimal until the Korean War. Because the U.S. Army maintained a presence in South Korea, many American soldiers returned with Korean wives who were exempt from Asian immigration quotas. As with other Asian groups, the number of Koreans in America has increased dramatically since the Immigration Reform Act of 1965. There have also been significant increases in the numbers of other Southeast Asian immigrants, such as Vietnamese, Cambodians, Laotians, and Hmong. Even though they have encountered prejudice, most refugees

emigrated to escape violence in their native countries. Because they are able to live safely with their families in the United States, they tend to be more optimistic about overcoming difficulties here (Pipher, 2002).

“Almost all people have this potential for evil, which would be unleashed only under certain . . . social circumstances.”

—IRIS CHANG (1968–2004)

In the early 1900s, Sikh farmers were the first Asian Indian immigrants to America. Landowners employed them instead of East Asian people who had been targets of nativist outrage. In 1923, a Punjabi immigrant named Bhagat Singh Thind applied for U.S. citizenship using “scientific” race theories to prove he was White. Having cited race theories to deny citizenship to previous non-White applicants, the U.S. Supreme Court nevertheless chose to ignore “science” in this case, asserting that Thind was not White because the justices did not believe him to be White (Zia, 2000).

Most Asian Indian immigration has occurred since 1965, with 80 percent of Indo-Americans being the first generation of immigrants. Yet Asian Indian immigration has involved significant numbers of people, producing an Indo-American population that is the fourth largest among all Asian groups (after Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos). Asian Indians are notable for linguistic and religious diversity, and they are culturally diverse, being more likely to identify with a province such as Bengal or Punjab than the country of India. Migrating Asian Indians often have academic qualifications in fields such as engineering, medicine, mathematics, and computer management. In one study of Asian immigrants employed as physicians, over half were Asian Indians (Kar, Campbell, Jiminez, & Gupta, 2000). Their success has contributed to the “model minority” myth that has been used to counter claims of discrimination by other minority groups.

What is the model minority myth?

Beginning in the 1960s, White Americans praised Asian Americans as a model minority because they had overcome all obstacles and achieved success. Other people of color were told that if they were willing to work as hard as Asian Americans, they could be just as successful, and if they failed, it was their own fault. The model minority myth has often been criticized as a distraction that avoids the reality of ongoing discrimination against Asian Americans.

How does the model minority myth distort reality?

As a group, Asian Americans exist on both extremes of social status, but the model minority myth focuses on the upper extreme. Data that seem to document their financial success need to be put in context. Asian Americans tend to live in urban areas of states where the cost of living is high, inflating salary data. According to the 2010 census, California had far more Asian Americans than any other state, with New York a distant second (East-West Center, 2012). Asian American incomes are also inflated because they are reported as household incomes. Although most American households consist of dual wage earners, Asian American households often have additional earners as well.

At the other extreme are Asian Americans working for low wages. In California and New York, most garment workers are Asian American or Hispanic women working over 40 hours a week for less than minimum wage (Freeman, 2013). Their wages are low because they are competing against Third World workers who are hired by companies outsourcing jobs or establishing factories in other countries, making multiple incomes a necessity for many Asian American households. Although it is appropriate to celebrate the success of those who overcome oppression, the model minority myth actually harms Asian Americans, as Fong and Shinagawa (2000) have explained:

[It] diverts attention away from serious social and economic problems that affect many segments of the Asian American population, detracts from both the subtle and overt racial discrimination encountered by Asian Americans, places undue pressure on young Asian Americans to succeed educationally and professionally, and fuels competition and resentment between Asian Americans and other groups. (p. 191)

Application Exercise 5.1

This video features a student who identifies with “the Asian community.” Think about the assumptions and stereotypes of people with Asian heritage that the speaker in the video discusses and how these relate to the “model minority myth.” Consider the ways in which she both challenges and reproduces these assumptions and stereotypes in her responses. Review the video and complete the activity.

Self-Check 5.3 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of the historic hostility of White Americans toward Asian immigrants, and explain how the model minority myth recognizes Asian American achievements while still stereotyping the group.

Diverse Latino Immigrants and the Obstacles They Encountered

There is no clear consensus on an appropriate term that includes all the diverse Spanish-speaking ethnic groups in the United States, but the immigration of Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central Americans, and South Americans has created a need for an inclusive generic term. In 1980, the U.S. Census Bureau suggested Latino as the generic term; however, some critics said that sounded like “Ladino,” an ancient form of Castilian Spanish spoken by Spanish Jews. The Bureau chose Hispanic, a label rejected by many Spanish-speaking people as a contrived, bureaucratic term (Shorris, 2001). Although Hispanic seems to be the preferred term in the southeastern United States and Texas, it is rejected in many other places, including most of California and much of the Midwest. Given this lack of consensus, both Hispanic and Latino are used in this final section.

Which Spanish-speaking group was the first to come to the United States?

The Spanish established the first permanent U.S. settlements in 1565 at St. Augustine, Florida, and in 1598 at Santa Fe, New Mexico, yet rarely do American history books mention this. Historically, school textbooks have focused on the English settlements in 1607 at Jamestown and in 1620 at Plymouth (Loewen, 2008). When the United States annexed Texas, Mexicans living there (Tejanos) found themselves in America; as the Tejanos like to say, “We didn’t cross the border; the border crossed us” (Shorris, 2001, p. 37). After the Mexican-American War, Mexico signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, giving up a million square miles of land, half of its territory. Mexicans living in newly declared American territory were given six months to decide either to stay and become U.S. citizens or to move to the redefined Mexico. Of the more than 82,000 Mexicans who had to choose, about 80,000 chose to stay (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

Article X of the treaty promised to honor the land claims of Mexicans who became citizens, but when the American Congress ratified the treaty, they rejected Article X. To reassure Mexico that the land titles and civil rights of Mexicans would be respected, American representatives presented a “Statement of Protocol” to the Mexican government with assurances that the U.S. government would not annul Mexican land grants and that these claims would be considered legitimate in American courts (Vento, 1998). That promise proved to be false.

Only a few Anglos, as Mexicans called White settlers, came to the new territory at first, but after gold was discovered in California, they flooded the

land. Anglos settled on Mexican American land, refusing to move, and authorities took no action against the “squatters.” When Anglos made legal claims to the land, Mexican Americans were forced to retain White lawyers to represent them because court proceedings were conducted in English. Although courts confirmed land grants for more than two million acres owned by Mexican Americans, they rejected Mexican American claims for almost 34 million acres (Vento, 1998). Even when the courts affirmed their claims, landowners often had to sell portions of their land to pay legal fees. Aggressive Anglo efforts soon created a society in former Mexican territory consisting of Anglo landowners and entrepreneurs and a pool of primarily Mexican laborers. As Shorris (2001) observed: “In less than a quarter of a century California changed from Spanish to Anglo” (p. 31), and with that change came an enormous transfer of wealth and culture.

“Poor Mexico, so far from God, so near to the United States.”

—PORFIRIO DÍAZ (1830–1915)

What was the experience like for Mexicans immigrating to the United States?

In the 1880s, Mexicans began crossing the border into the United States, recruited by American employers after the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed in 1882. Mexican immigrants tended to take jobs in agriculture, mining, and construction; they constituted 70 percent of workers laying track for the Southern Pacific and Santa Fe railroads. Although American businesses actively recruited them, many Anglos perceived Mexicans as inferior. Mexicans were refused admission to public places such as beaches and restaurants. All members of Mexican families participated in agricultural work; child labor laws were not enforced. Experienced workers might make up to $1.50 per day compared to $4 to $5 a day earned by miners (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

Mexicans did not passively accept such exploitation. In 1903, Mexican and Japanese farm workers formed the Japanese-Mexican Labor Association (JMLA) and engaged in a strike to increase hourly wages. They were successful, but they couldn’t survive without support from national labor organizations. They petitioned the American Federation of Labor (AFL) to accept JMLA members, but AFL president Samuel Gompers insisted that the JMLA would be granted a membership charter only if it excluded Asian members. The Mexicans refused to betray their Japanese co-workers, so the charter was not granted (Takaki, 1993). Although the JMLA did not survive, Mexican farm workers continued to strike and protest against low wages.

Because of the Gentleman's Agreement of 1908 and the restrictive 1924 immigration law, Mexico was regarded as an excellent source of cheap labor. By 1910, 222,000 Mexicans lived in the United States, some as far north as Montana. Many migrated to escape the violence of the Mexican Revolution from 1910 to about 1920. When the revolution was over, only 10 percent of Mexico's citizens were landowners, and the northern migration continued (Vento, 1998). By 1930, 90,000 Mexicans lived in Los Angeles, representing about 10 percent of the city's population. Smaller numbers settled in Denver, Pittsburgh, and St. Louis, and over 20,000 Mexicans lived in Chicago (Duignan & Gann, 1998). Only a small number of these immigrants applied for citizenship, perhaps because the proximity of Mexico made it easier to consider returning.

To promote Latino immigrants applying for citizenship, the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) was formed in the 1920s. In addition to being American citizens, members promoted assimilation by encouraging the use of English and affirming the virtues of citizenship. Although criticized for its middle-class bias, for many years LULAC was the only Latino organization to have a national presence. LULAC worked to improve education for Latino students, protest discrimination, and promote civil rights for Hispanic Americans (Vento, 1998). LULAC also encouraged Latinos to become citizens so they would be less vulnerable to nativist activities. LULAC's efforts were only marginally successful, but World War II would cause a more significant change in American attitudes toward Mexican immigrants.

Why did attitudes toward Mexicans change during World War II?

When the United States entered the war, the government began negotiations for Mexicans to replace the workers who had joined the military and the Japanese workers who had been taken to relocation camps. The U.S. government proposed a Bracero Program (braceros referring to contract laborers), which offered transportation and jobs; the Mexican government felt that this program would also provide Mexicans with an opportunity to learn about American agricultural practices. In 1942, the Bracero Program was implemented.

The U.S. government had guaranteed that Mexican workers would be paid the "prevailing wage" for their labor, but supervision of the program was inadequately funded, and many growers abused it by failing to pay the promised wages. In Texas, growers with a history of employing illegal immigrants continued to use them because they were less costly to hire. Although the Bracero Program was criticized on both sides of the border, it

lasted well beyond World War II. When it ended in 1964, the program had issued almost five million contracts to Mexican workers (Vargas, 2000). In addition to the contribution of Mexican workers, more than 500,000 Spanish-speaking soldiers, primarily Mexican Americans, joined the American armed forces, the highest percentage of soldiers from any ethnic community (Takaki, 1993). Despite their willingness to fight for the country, many Latino soldiers encountered prejudice from fellow soldiers and in communities where they were stationed. One of the most publicized examples of anti-Latino prejudice was the Zoot Suit Riots.

What were the Zoot Suit Riots?

On June 3, 1943, 11 sailors on shore leave in Los Angeles claimed to have been attacked by a gang of Mexican youth. Local media often stereotyped young Mexicans wearing flamboyant “zoot suits” as criminals and gangsters. (See Figure 5.6.) On June 4, soldiers and sailors rented 20 taxicabs and cruised the barrio, attacking those who looked Latino, especially anyone wearing a zoot suit. At the Carmen Theater, sailors charged in and grabbed youth wearing zoot suits, ripping off their clothes and beating them severely. The police arrested several Mexican American youth, and the local media portrayed the sailors as heroes (Banks, 2009; Vento, 1998).

Figure 5.6 Zoot Suit

A soldier appears to be admiring a zoot suit, but servicemen would justify attacking Mexican American youth during the Zoot Suit Riots by claiming it was unpatriotic to wear zoot suits requiring so much cloth when cloth was being rationed because of the war.

Photograph by John Ferrel (1942). Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division [John Ferrell/LC-USF34-011543-D]

The following night sailors and soldiers marched into the barrio, invading bars and businesses, destroying property, and attacking patrons. Local police refused to charge them with destruction of private property or assault. On June 7, civilians and servicemen formed a mob of thousands, attacking anyone who looked Latino, including several Filipinos and Black people. Some were left naked and bleeding on the streets. Los Angeles police arrested 600 Mexican American youth. Eleanor Roosevelt declared in her newspaper column that the riots were the result of “long standing discrimination against Mexicans” (Vento, 1998, p. 187). Los Angeles police and city government denied the accusation, but as they followed the events in the newspapers,

Latinos, especially Latino soldiers, were angry that they were still not accepted in their adopted land.

“I believe cruelty is the inability to assign the same feelings and values to another person that you harbor in yourself.”

—CARLOS FUENTES (1928–2012)

Was it better for Latinos after the war?

Latino communities felt a great deal of pride in their returning veterans. Latino soldiers earned numerous bronze and silver stars given for bravery in battle, and 17 Latino soldiers received the nation’s highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor (Duignan & Gann, 1998). Because Latino soldiers had not been segregated and had served with White soldiers, some also rose to positions of command. As Shorris (2001) stated, “Men who had commanded Anglo troops in battle did not cringe before them in civilian life” (p. 97).

Although they had encountered difficulty getting home loans before the war, Latino soldiers now had their loan applications approved. The GI Bill allowed many to pursue a college education. These soldiers represented only a small portion of Latinos, but their experiences demonstrated that Latinos could receive equitable treatment. Yet the majority of Latinos still encountered prejudice and discrimination, even those who had served in the military. At Three Rivers, Texas, a funeral home director refused to bury Felix Longoria, a Mexican American who had been decorated for heroism in World War II. After Mexican Americans protested, Longoria was finally buried with military honors at Arlington National Cemetery (Shorris, 2001).

How did Mexican Americans respond to discrimination after the war?

Challenging racially segregated schools, Mexican Americans brought Mendez v. Westminster School District to California courts in 1946; the judge ruled it was unconstitutional to segregate Mexican American children. This case and others helped the NAACP to bring Brown v. Board of Education to the Supreme Court in 1954. Recognizing the need for a legal organization similar to the NAACP, an attorney in San Antonio named Pete Tijerina persuaded the Ford Foundation to provide $2.2 million to establish the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF). MALDEF continues to confront discrimination against Mexican Americans.

To establish a fair wage for agricultural workers in California, Cesar Chavez assisted farm workers in creating a union. Chavez led a strike lasting from

1965 until 1970, resulting in a contract with one of the major growers. After another seven years of activism, the remaining growers agreed to pay farm workers standardized wages and benefits. Also in the 1960s, some Mexican American youth began to refer to themselves as “Chicanos,” a term that had historically been used as a slur directed at Mexican migrant labor (Kazin, 2011). In Crystal City, Texas, Mexican Americans, who were a large majority of the residents, formed a third party called La Raza Unida and won control of the city council and the school board. They instituted bilingual education programs and hired numerous Mexican American administrators and teachers.

In 1957, El Paso citizens elected Raymond Telles as the first Mexican American mayor in the United States. In 2005, Antonio Villaraigosa was the first Mexican American mayor of Los Angeles. Political candidates in the Southwest, urban areas, and California court Mexican American voters, and in 2011, there were 5850 Latinos in public office. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2016), Mexican Americans are almost two thirds of all Latinos in the United States, followed by Puerto Ricans (9.5 percent), Salvadorans, and Cubans (almost 4 percent for each). Unlike other Latino immigrants, however, Puerto Ricans came to America already claiming U.S. citizenship.

How did Puerto Ricans become citizens of the United States?

When Spanish ships arrived in 1493, they called the island San Juan Batista and the harbor Puerto Rico; over time the names reversed and the “rich port” of San Juan became the capital of the island of Puerto Rico (Fitzpatrick, 1971). The 70,000 Tainos inhabiting the island were almost exterminated, so Africans were imported to work as slaves. Because Spain mainly sent soldiers, marriages and relationships took place between Spaniards, Tainos, and Africans, producing the range of skin colors from light to dark that can be found among Puerto Ricans today. In 1897, the Spanish government agreed to give Puerto Rico more autonomy, but the Spanish-American War made Puerto Rico a U.S. possession.

After almost 20 years of autocratic rule by the United States, Congress responded to Puerto Rican demands for more autonomy by passing the Jones Act in 1917. Puerto Ricans elected representatives to their two legislative bodies as well as a resident commissioner, but the U.S. president still

appointed the governor and maintained veto power (Fitzpatrick, 1971). The Jones Act also provided the opportunity for Puerto Ricans to become U.S. citizens, giving them six months to make a decision. Although it made them eligible for military service, only 287 out of more than a million people rejected U.S. citizenship (Perez y Gonzalez, 2000).

What effect did becoming part of the United States have on Puerto Rico?

When the United States assumed control, Puerto Rican farmers owned 93 percent of the farmland. By 1930, 60 percent of sugar beet production and almost all tobacco production came from farms with absentee owners, primarily American corporations. Although the United States built more roads and schools, the basis of the economy was transformed from small farms producing food to meet the local need to large farms hiring low-wage workers and exporting their products (Feagin & Feagin, 2008). Soon the island was not producing enough food for its own people, and malnutrition became common. Because of improved health care, Puerto Rico's population doubled by 1940, but jobs did not. Agriculture jobs paid as little as six cents an hour. By 1910, about 1500 Puerto Ricans had come to America because of economic hardship, with a third of them living in Spanish Harlem in New York City (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

In the 1930s, Luis Marín formed the Popular Democratic Party (or "Populares") to address Puerto Rico's economic problems. The party sponsored legislation to limit the amount of land that absentee owners could control; land returned to the government was redistributed to small farmers, but two thirds of American corporations refused to cooperate with the law (Perez y Gonzalez, 2000). Puerto Ricans expressed their frustration by demanding more autonomy from the United States.

In 1949, the United States allowed Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor, and they elected Luis Marín. Three years later, Congress approved the proposed Puerto Rican Constitution, giving the island the status of a commonwealth. Although it now had more autonomy, Puerto Rico also had significant economic problems. After sixty years of American rule, more than 50 percent of the total national income went to 20 percent of the people, and there was persistent unemployment and underemployment (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

Governor Marín proposed an ambitious economic plan called Operation Bootstrap that offered incentives such as a large supply of cheap labor and tax exemptions for businesses moving to Puerto Rico. Many corporations took advantage of this offer. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, Operation Bootstrap expanded the island's industrial base and created 140,000 manufacturing jobs. Personal income rose from an annual average of $118 in 1940 to $1200 by 1970 (Perez y Gonzalez, 2000). Tourism increased, and Puerto Rico was called the "Showcase of the Americas," but economic problems persisted. With so much land being used for industry, the number of agricultural jobs decreased, resulting in unemployment rates as high as 10 percent. So much land was given over for industrial use that Puerto Rico had to import food. Corporate tax exemptions required Puerto Ricans to pay higher taxes to fund the necessary improvements in sewers, roads, electricity, and water (Feagin & Feagin, 2008).

For many Puerto Ricans, the primary economic benefit was the opportunity to earn enough money to migrate to the United States. By the 1980s, more than 900,000 were living in New York City alone, comprising about 12 percent of the city's population, and the three million Puerto Ricans living in the United States represented 11 percent of all Latinos. Approximately 60 percent of Puerto Ricans lived in either New York or New Jersey, but with unemployment rates as high as 23 percent, nearly 60 percent of these Puerto Rican families lived in poverty (Banks, 2009; Duignan & Gann, 1998).

How do the experiences of Puerto Ricans in the United States compare to those of other Latino groups?

Puerto Ricans have encountered many obstacles in the United States. The percentages of Puerto Ricans who are unemployed or on welfare have been higher than for other Latino groups. In part, the high unemployment rate is the result of a decline in unskilled and semiskilled jobs in the urban areas where they have settled. Puerto Rican children living in poverty have attended racially segregated urban schools without resources to provide the quality of education necessary for their students to compete for better paying jobs. One consequence of these economic and social problems is that Puerto Ricans have historically had higher rates of drug use, drug addiction, and crime than other Latino groups (Perez y Gonzalez, 2000).

Yet Puerto Ricans have succeeded in a variety of fields, including literature, sports, politics, the arts, music, medicine, and more. For over 40 years the Puerto Rican organization called Aspira has supported high school clubs to encourage Puerto Rican youth to graduate and go to college. Regardless of their success or failure, Puerto Ricans resent other Americans perceiving them as foreigners rather than regarding them as the fellow citizens that they are. If they migrate from Puerto Rico to a state, or from one state to another, Puerto Ricans should be viewed the same as a Minnesotan who moves to New York.

“Come from where it may, racism divides.”

—JOSÉ MARTÍ (1853–1895)

Today, there are over a million more Puerto Ricans living in the United States than in Puerto Rico, and the majority of them were born here. Puerto Ricans tend to be bilingual and bicultural, identifying themselves as Puerto Ricans but proud of their status as American citizens. Like other Latinos, they often speak Spanish at home, but young people are more likely to speak English to their peers. Although Puerto Rican Americans have attained higher levels of education and income compared to all U.S. Latinos, the percentage of them who are unemployed (12.8 percent) or living in poverty (27 percent) is also higher compared to all other U.S. Latinos (Perez & Patten, 2015).

Why has the experience of Cubans been so different from that of Puerto Ricans?

The islands of Cuba and Puerto Rico have similar histories. Columbus and his men conquered the Taino Indians, inhabiting both islands and enslaving the residents. Yet by 1762, Cuba’s capital city was twice the size of New York or Philadelphia; Havana was a port of such significance that the British captured the city and refused to give it back until Spain agreed to give up Florida in exchange. In addition to being a major trading center in the Caribbean, Cuba prospered because of its sugar production carried out by imported African slaves. By 1830, the combination of free and enslaved Black people was larger than the population of White people. By 1870, Cubans were trying to

win independence from Spain; a few Cubans immigrated to the United States during the lengthy struggle that ended in 1898 when American troops prevailed in the Spanish-American War.

After four years of military rule, the United States agreed to make Cuba a sovereign nation, but the Platt amendment gave the United States the right to intervene in Cuba's affairs at any time to protect property and liberty in Cuba. For the next two decades, no Cuban who did not gain U.S. approval could be elected president nor stay in that office (Feagin & Feagin, 2008).

Even under American dominance, Cuba prospered; few Cubans immigrated to the United States until Fidel Castro's successful revolt against dictator Fulgencio Batista. After Castro announced that Cuba would be a communist nation, Cubans began leaving, most immigrating to Florida. The wealthiest Cubans left first. Those who followed in the 1960s were a heterogeneous group but with a disproportionately high number of businessmen, professionals, and entrepreneurs. Many had been in the merchant navy; others were former government officials or were revolutionaries who were disillusioned with Castro (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

What happened to the Cubans who came to the United States?

A federally funded Cuban Refugee Program (CRP) was established to assist Cubans coming to Florida. CRP refugee centers provided resources rarely given to other immigrants (Portes & Bach, 1985). Cuban businessmen who had salvaged some of their wealth relied on traditional business methods called socios or socioismo, in which loans were approved not by an objective analysis but because the applicant was a friend. Cuban immigrants tended to be educated, and many had business experience. For the next two decades, Cubans used their resources to engage in business enterprises as well as to provide services such as grocery stores, legal assistance, and funeral homes for fellow Cubans. As Shorris (2001) stated, "The Cuban exiles, primarily middle- and upper middle-class, soon became middle- and upper middle-class again" (p. 67). Attracted by Cuban success in the United States and disenchanted with Castro's communism, more Cubans came.

The next wave of Cuban immigrants tended to be working-class people from urban areas (almost half from Havana alone). Many found work in businesses owned or managed by Cubans, where they tended to earn higher wages. By the mid-1980s, Cuban Americans were the majority in Dade County and in Miami. Although 40 percent of Cuban immigrants settled in Florida, they also settled in New York, New Jersey, and California (Duignan & Gann, 1998). A

1953 Cuban census identified 72 percent of Cubans as White, but the 1970 U.S. census identified 95 percent of Cubans living in the United States as White (Portes & Bach, 1985).

Compared to other major Latino groups in the United States, Cuban Americans have recorded the highest median household incomes. One reason for their success is that, similar to Asian American families, they tend to have multiple wage earners in a household. According to a study of Cuban immigration from 1960 to 1980, about two thirds of Cuban American wives worked outside the home, and 27 percent of these households had additional family members earning income. The presence of Cubans in Florida has attracted an increasing number of tourists and entrepreneurs from both Central and South America, providing additional business opportunities.

Although Cuban immigrants have traditionally viewed themselves as a people in exile, that view is not shared by Cuban American youth. According to Shorris (2001), “Older Cubans say they will return to Cuba as soon as Castro dies or is deposed. The younger generation is interested only in going back to visit” (p. 75). Their attitudes are similar to Mexican American and Puerto Rican youth, as well as other Latinos living in the United States. In 2015, President Obama issued an the executive order to restore U.S. relations with Cuba. Although tourism continued to be banned, travel restrictions were reduced significantly, and those young people who wanted to return to Cuba for a visit could now do so. President Trump restricted parts of this policy when he came into office (Persio, 2017).

President Trump reversed a number of these policies when he came into office (Persio, 2017).

What other Latino groups live in the United States?

Other Hispanic immigrant groups have come to the United States in the twentieth century. Since the 1960s, there has been a small but steady stream of immigrants from the Dominican Republic, surging in the early 1980s because of the global recession that drove down sugar prices, creating a huge foreign debt and an unemployment rate of 30 percent. By the time

the crisis was over, 10 percent of Dominicans had immigrated, primarily to the United States, with 90 percent settling in New York City (Duignan & Gann, 1998).

Video Example 5.4

This video discusses the fears and challenges that immigrant students face when they have undocumented family members. What are some of the ways discussed in which certain assignments or school environments create challenges for undocumented students and families? What might be some other ways in which schools can create challenges for undocumented students and families that are not discussed in the video?

Immigrants from Central America have usually come to the United States to escape political turmoil and violence in places like Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. In 2015, there were 3.4 million Central Americans living in the United States, nearly half of them in three states: California, Texas, and Florida. Compared to other immigrants, Central Americans tend to have less education; about 67 percent had limited proficiency in English compared to 49 percent for all other immigrants. On the other hand, Central American immigrants were more likely to be employed, but even though 73 percent of their adults were in the labor force, 22 percent of Central American immigrants live in poverty (Lesser & Batalova, 2017). Central Americans have tended to settle in urban areas, and so many Salvadorans have settled in Los Angeles that it is now the second largest Salvadoran city in the world after San Salvador, the nation’s capital.

“What the people want is very simple. They want an America as good as its promise.”

—BARBARA JORDAN (1936–1996)

Self-Check 5.4 Complete this self-check quiz to check your understanding of the diverse Latino groups that have immigrated to the United States and the different obstacles each group has encountered.

Afterword

Human evolution is a story of survival, but once physical survival is assured, human beings create culture. The struggle to maintain one’s culture while living in a new homeland with its own culture is no easy task, especially because physical and cultural differences have been used to create the concept of race. Race has then been used to divide human groups, creating subordinate races that are forced to struggle against a dominant race.

For the indigenous people in America, this struggle began when European colonists stepped on American shores. The roots of oppression expanded across the nation in the cultural and physical conflict that followed. The oppression eventually encompassed enslaved Africans, Chinese and Japanese laborers, Mexican migrant workers, other immigrants of color, and groups considered White today, like Irish, Italian, and Slavic immigrants.

Oppression based on race and extended to include ethnic groups has been sustained by the descendants of the original European settlers, affecting people of color living in the United States and those who are coming with the same vision of freedom and opportunity that brought the first colonists. We are now a nation of nations with people from all over the world pursuing the happiness promised by a free society.

Summary

European colonists rejected many cultural benefits offered by indigenous people who persisted in maintaining their cultural differences and their tribal sovereignty, but all tribes are still encountering issues that affect the lives and well-being of their people.

Slavery was disputed during the colonial period as both Black and White people took actions to end it prior to the Civil War, and afterward Black people continued to struggle against oppression, culminating in the civil rights confrontations following World War II.

American attitudes toward Asian immigration reveal a historic pattern of rejection until more recently when the development of the model minority myth illustrated respect for Asian American achievements while misrepresenting the reality of their diversity.

The immigration experiences of Mexicans, Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and other Latinos have involved some similarities but more differences, especially the historic obstacles that have confronted each group.

Terms and Definitions

AnglosA term identifying White people who settled in Mexican territory, eventually becoming a generic term for White people

Black CabinetThe Federal Council on Negro Affairs, consisting of 30 Black professionals, served as an advisory group to President Franklin Roosevelt

Bracero ProgramInitiated during World War II, this program continued to import Mexicans to work as manual laborers in the United States for 22 years

Brown v. Board of EducationThe 1954 Supreme Court decision overturning Plessy v. Ferguson by declaring racial segregation unconstitutional

Chinese Exclusion ActAn 1882 law prohibiting Chinese immigration to the United States, renewed in 1892, and making exclusion permanent in 1902

Emancipation ProclamationIssued by President Lincoln to free slaves only in Confederate states and permitting free Black men to enlist in the Union Army

EthnocentrismBelieving your race, nation, or culture is superior to all others; also individual actions or institutional practices based on that belief

Gentleman’s AgreementThe Japanese government assured the U.S. government it would issue no more passports (as of 1908) to Japanese workers except those already in the United States or their close relatives

Indian SovereigntyLegal rights of Indian nations, confirmed by treaties with the U.S. government, to define themselves and to act as unique cultural and legal entities

Indigenous peopleA racial or ethnic group that is well established in an area before the arrival of a new group; a group that may be but does not need be native to the area in which it is established

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)A national organization for members of Spanish-speaking ethnic groups who are American citizens that is dedicated to promoting the value of citizenship, protesting discrimination, and advocating for civil rights for Latinos

Mexican American Legal Defense Fund (MALDEF)An organization opposing discrimination and advocating for Mexican Americans’ civil rights

Middle PassageThe ocean crossing of slave ships resulting in the deaths of an estimated five to six million Africans being transported as slaves

Model minorityThe belief that Asian Americans have been successful because they have been willing to work hard and that all other minorities could be just as successful if they emulated Asian American behavior

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)An organization opposing racism and advocating for Black civil rights

NiseiThe term for children of Japanese immigrants who were born in the United States and therefore possessed U.S. citizenship

NomadsA group of individuals with no single fixed abode who move from place to place in search of food and water

Operation BootstrapAn economic plan for Puerto Rico during the 1950s and 1960s to boost its industrial base and create more manufacturing jobs

Picture brideA modification of the Japanese system for arranged marriages involving the exchange of photographs between families negotiating marriage for Japanese men who had immigrated to the United States

TreatyA legal agreement between two or more nations involving terms of peace, trade, and other matters as agreed to by the negotiating parties

Underground RailroadAn organization that established “stations” where runaway slaves could get food and rest as they escaped north to freedom

Yellow PerilThe term for the belief that Chinese and Japanese immigrants could never be assimilated into American culture and therefore threatened the unity of American society

Zoot Suit RiotsSeveral days of mob violence in 1942 in Los Angeles that demonstrated anti-Latino prejudice as U.S. servicemen (later joined by civilians) attacked Mexican American youth, especially targeting those wearing zoot suits

Discussion Exercises

Exercise 1: Understanding Recollections of Larry Kobori Activity

Directions: Read to learn the feelings that Larry recounts having had about the incident that he describes. Then respond to the Insight Builder Questions below.

Larry Kobori’s School Story

When I was young I noticed I was a little different from my friends. My father told me I was Japanese and that I should never be ashamed of being Japanese. When I started school everything was perfect until the fourth grade. Some kids called me a “Chink.” I told them I’m Japanese, not Chinese. If I was going to be called a dirty name, at least use the proper dirty name. My friends always told me to forget those kids, that those kids were stupid. I was glad to hear my friends say that.

In the seventh grade we started to read about World War II. I knew Japan had attacked Pearl Harbor. I never answered any questions. I would just slouch in

my chair. I was feeling ashamed and embarrassed at the atrocities of Japan during World War II. But I didn't understand why the textbooks and my teacher glorified America's bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Thousands of civilians, including women and children, were killed by the atom bombs to make Japan surrender. She added that the bombings had saved many American lives.

I asked my teacher, "Wouldn't that be considered an atrocity since so many civilians died? That's the way you describe Japanese atrocities." I'll never forget the way she stared at me and said, "There's a difference." Even today that episode is still clear as a bell for me.

My three years in high school were the best years. I was really accepted. I couldn't compete on the high school level so I did what I could to help. I was the varsity scorekeeper in football, basketball, and baseball. I learned the plays and found myself getting to know the other guys. I was encouraged to write sport stories in the local newspaper, and the players liked what I wrote.

Outside of class sometimes it was a different story. Traveling with the basketball team, some Black and Mexican players called me a "Jap." Remembering my promise, I restrained myself and did not retaliate.

I'll never understand why those people called me a "Jap."

Insight Builder Questions

What are your impressions of Larry Kobori?

Do you think Larry Kobori's responses to the racial incidents were appropriate ways to deal with the discrimination he experienced?

What alternatives did Larry have, and which would you recommend as the best strategy?

In your opinion, how should teachers present the Japanese role in World War II? The use of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

Exercise 2: College Racial Incidents Activity

Directions: Imagine you are a college counselor or residence hall assistant when the student in each incident comes to you to report what happened. What sort of advice would you give to this student? Explain why your advice represents the best course of action for the student to follow.

A Puerto Rican American, Jorge, interviewed for a graduate assistantship position. The director discussed the role and responsibility of the assistantship position and indicated that the primary responsibility would be to supervise outreach activities for Hispanic students who were not using available student services. The director believed that Jorge would be a good role model and could convince students to use services since there were biological factors resulting in some people being able to learn more and to be more intelligent than others. Noting Jorge's negative response, the director said he just wanted to be open and honest about his opinions.

When in the Marine Corps, Leonard, a Lakota Sioux, had been stationed in the United States and Germany. After serving three years, he returned to his reservation and enrolled in a nearby college. Visiting a sweat lodge, Leonard's friends and older members of the tribe shared stories of their ancestors. When Leonard had been a child, he remembered listening to his father telling stories about his great-grandfather; he had always enjoyed learning about his family history. Now Leonard realized, however, that the stories had no meaning for him. He found himself in conflict with his family and friends. He considered dropping out of college to get a job, but he knew there weren't many jobs for people with only a high school diploma. Leonard became more depressed and began to think that the only resolution was to drop out of college and reenlist in the Marines.

Jessica, a 22-year-old Mexican American from Illinois, left home to attend college in California. A few weeks into the semester she noticed that the majority of Hispanic students were able to speak both English and Spanish fluently. Although her parents spoke Spanish at home, they did not insist that their children become bilingual, so Jessica could understand Spanish if someone spoke to her, but she was not a fluent Spanish speaker. Jessica talked to the Chicano studies professor after class, who assured her that not

all Mexican Americans share the same sociocultural experience, but that all people needed to understand and respect the values of others. He also suggested that if this situation continued to bother Jessica, she should consider seeing a counselor. In her English class, consisting primarily of White students, Jessica felt comfortable and relaxed; however, in a Chicano studies course, she felt out of place because she did not share the experiences of the other Hispanic students.